

JPRS-UWE-84-008

11 July 1984

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 4, April 1984

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

11 July 1984

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 4, April 1984

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

English Summaries of Major Articles in MEMO Journal (pp 158-159).....	1
Zagladin on World Crisis, Lenin's Teachings (pp 3-24) (V. Zagladin).....	4
True Values and False Ideals (pp 25-37) (E. Kuz'min) (not translated)	
Limited Nuclear War Concept, U.S. Policy Criticized (pp 38-50) (V. Kortunov).....	32
U.S. 'Gunboat Diplomacy' in Lebanon, Support for Israel (pp 51-63) (O. Kovtunovich, V. Nosenko).....	47
New Features of Monopoly Business (pp 64-70) (Ya. Pevzner) (not translated)	
Employer Groups in Japan (pp 71-81) (H. Okumoura) (not translated)	
INTERNATIONAL ROUNDUP	
Current Problems of World Politics (pp 82-101) (V. Babak, V. Vladimirov, K. Nikolayev).....	61

OUR COMMENTARY

Disagreements Are Growing (pp 102-105)
(T. Kosyрева) (not translated)

SOCIOLOGIST'S OPINION

Western Sociologists' Optimism on 'Information Society' Criticized (pp 106-114)
(Yu. Nikulichev) (editorial report)..... 79

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

Transnational Corporations in the Economy of the Developing World
(p 115-124)
(A. Bereznoy) (not translated)

International Activity of French Banks (pp 125-132)
(G. Vlasov) (not translated)

State Regulation of Power Engineering in Developed Capitalist Countries
(pp 133-140)
(L. Zonova, V. Chernyavina) (not translated)

BOOKS, AUTHORS

Book on Development of Worker Control Over Production (pp 141-143)
(Yu. Borko)..... 80

Role of Persian Gulf Oil in International Economy Reviewed (pp 143-145)
(A. El'yanov)..... 84

Yu. Oleshchuk review of "The State, Class and the Recession" edited
by Steward Clegg, Geoff Dow and Paul Boreham (pp 145-147)
(not translated)

Lukin Book on U.S., European, Japanese Changes in Influence (pp 147-150)
(V. Baranovskiy)..... 88

Books Detailing Problems of ASEAN Reviewed (pp 150-152)
(E. Grebenshchikov)..... 92

R. Leshchiner review of F.L. Bromberg's "Scientific-Technical Progress
and the Development of the Power Engineering of the Main Capitalist
Countries" (pp 152-154) (not translated)

G. Ponedelko, I. Tsapenko review of Sima Liberman's "The Contemporary
Spanish Economy: A Historical Perspective" (pp 154-155) (not translated)

Obituary of Sergey Ivanovich Tyul'panov (p 156) (not translated)

PUBLICATION DATA

English title	: WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS No 4, April 1984
Russian title	: MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA
Author (s)	:
Editor (s)	: Ya.S. Khavinson
Publishing House	: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda"
Place of Publication	: Moscow
Date of Publication	: April 1984
Signed to press	: 16 March 1984
Copies	: 29,000 r
COPYRIGHT	: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES IN MEMO JOURNAL

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 158-159

[Text] The article by V. Zagladin "Present-Day International Crisis in the Light of Lenin's Teaching" is concerned with the increasingly tension-ridden international situation, characterized by destabilized international relations and imminent threat of nuclear war. Special attention is paid to the particular danger of confrontation which has spread not only to politics, economy and ideology but also involves the military-political sphere with its monstrous race of weapons. Not only do old hotbeds of conflict exist but new ones appear. The article considers the present-day international crisis to be not an isolated phenomenon. It notes that only the Marxist-Leninist theory and above all Lenin's teaching about imperialism in the present epoch as well as the international relations inherent in it are the key to a comprehension of the situation, providing for an objective and clear class approach. The author points out that an analysis of present-day international crisis assumes not only political and ideological but also theoretical and conceptional importance. Such a study according to the author's opinion makes possible, with due consideration for the new phenomena, a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the principal trends of social development and the development of the two systems in conditions of the growing strength and influence of socialism, strategic parity between socialism and imperialism.

E. Kuz'min in the article "True Values and False Ideals" presents a parallel examination of the socialist and capitalist system and shows how advantageous socialism is over capitalism while providing for the rights and freedoms of man and the interests and aspirations of the working people. The author concentrates on the inner nature of Soviet democracy as a society of social justice and genuine democracy, fundamentally reveals the new quality of life of the working people incorporating the entire spectrum of sanguine human life. The author criticizes such bourgeois concepts as "political pluralism", "Open society" etc, trying to discredit socialist democracy while advertising the bourgeois one. The article convincingly shows that absent in socialism is a social ground, any objective class base for the realization of capitalist "pluralistic models" and explains the incompatibility between genuine democracy and capitalism. It explains why genuine democracy is possible only under socialism as vividly manifested in the activities of the main organ of Soviet democracy--the Soviets of People's Deputies. The expansion and improvement of Soviet statehood are an important area of Soviet society's onward movement the article states.

V. Kortunov's article "Limited Nuclear War as a Strategy of Global Suicide" focuses attention upon the doctrine of "limited nuclear war" popular in the USA at present. It explains why such importance is attached to this concept both on the military-political and propaganda plane by the aggressive circles who have chosen murder and blackmail as a continuous factor of their policy. In his striving to make a fuller study of the problem the author reveals the roots of this conception, its evolution and risky nature. Special stress is laid on the latest applications of the idea most notably reinforced since R. Reagan's rise to power. The article exposes the dangerous nature of the doctrine and its latest elaboration. To the American doctrine of "limited nuclear war" the Soviet Union counterposes its clear-cut stand: Peace must be safeguarded as the apple of the eye and the security of our Motherland ensured. Nuclear war--whether, big or small, whether limited or total must not be allowed to break out.

O. Kovtunovich and V. Nosenko in the article "The Middle East-Imperialist Policy of Strength in Action" focus their attention on the principal trends of American policy in the Middle East in the late 1970's and early 1980's and Washington's tendency to use military methods to reach its foreign-policy aims in the region. The authors trace different stages of the growing use by America of armed forces in the Middle East including the period from the Carter administration's plan to build up "Rapid Deployment Forces" to the Reagan administration's commitment to use the regular U.S. troops in Lebanon. Special stress is laid on the fact that the shifts to be observed in American policy have firstly, contributed to Israeli's blunt escalation of aggression in relation to the neighboring Arab countries and its more rigid approach to the problem of the occupied in the 1967th territories; and secondly have mounted new grave obstacles on the road of a just settlement of the Middle East conflict. The article outlines U.S. and Israeli activities in Lebanon which add to the complexity of the risky situation in the country. The existing situation aggravates tension in the Middle East thus directly menacing world peace.

The "New Features of Monopolistic Entrepreneurship" by Ya. Pevzner provides an extended commentary on Okumoura's study of entrepreneurial groups in Japan, published in the same issue.

The present-day economic theory focuses on new features of the interaction of the bourgeois state and private business. According to the Neoconservative postulates, "supply-side economics" paradigmas in particular, there is flagrant evidence to the fact that state regulation is openly oriented towards more active support of capitalist corporations.

Ya. Pevzner indicates that H. Okumoura managed to discover the essential features of such processes inherent to all industrial capitalist countries taking a very specific example of Japan. To his opinion Japanese economist contributed to the examination of industrial structure of the concentration of capital process, tracing the interpenetration of monopoly and competition.

Beyond Okumoura's study are the problems of the state monopoly regulation, acquiring special importance in course of the ongoing administrative and financial reform in Japan, aimed at fostering the private initiative at

governmental, so to say, expenses. This reform can be regarded as Japanese version of Neoconservative economic prescriptions envisaging the curtailment of state interference in economic matters, leading even to privatisation of state property. This policy would inevitably provoke growth of unemployment and increase of social tension.

H. Okumoura. Japanese economist and scientific consultant of Japanese firms took part in the 15th symposium of Soviet and Japanese economists held in Moscow last year. In this issue we present his report "Entrepreneurial Groups in Japan".

The author dwells upon the main forms of vertical and horizontal integration of Japanese business stressing the particulars of the concentration of capital process in Japan. Taking an in-depth view of the design of centralization of capital within the infra-firm partnerships the author provides a firm empirical foundation for a very important hypothesis that Japanese pattern of business partnership in production of intermediate good comprises sharp competition in marketing of finalised goods.

The corporative economy of Japan, due to its flexibility and comparative efficiency has contributed greatly to the growth of international competitiveness of Japan thus involving adverse effects upon the interimperialist relations. The further evolution of corporativism in Japan would depend heavily on the possibility of a compromise between the pursued course towards political collaboration with the imperialist counterparts and mounting economic conflicts in world capitalist trade, export of capital, transfer of technology. For the corporative design of economy has revealed not only its efficiency in Japan but also certain margins in perspective, this compromise turns up to be an urgent task for the ruling circles in Japan.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

CSO: 1812/173-E

ZAGLADIN ON WORLD CRISIS, LENIN'S TEACHINGS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 3-24

[Vadim Zagladin article: "The Contemporary International Crisis in the Light of Lenin's Teaching"--words in all capitals published in boldface]

[Text]

I

The international situation at the beginning of the eighties is characterized by a high degree of tension. The dangerous exacerbation of this tension has led to a serious destabilization in interstate relations. The threat of the outbreak of a nuclear war has increased.

The external symptoms of the aforementioned processes are well known. The question is primarily one of the exceptional intensification in the confrontation between American imperialism and NATO, and the Soviet Union and socialism in general. What is particularly dangerous is the fact that this confrontation has not just spread to the spheres of politics, the economy, and ideology. The opposition between the two military-political blocs--NATO and the Warsaw Pact--has acquired both new forms and content. This is particularly reflected in the deployment of American first-strike missiles in Western Europe, to which the Soviet Union and its allies have been compelled to respond with corresponding countermeasures.

Further, the question is one of the monstrous arms race, which truly has no analogy in the past. Weapons are not only being amassed at an accelerated rate, but are being fundamentally and qualitatively perfected. Thus, nuclear weapons are becoming more and more accurate and, at the same time, more compact, even miniature, which narrows the prospects of establishing effective control over them. Attempts are being made to introduce these weapons into space, which would create an unprecedented threat for the whole of mankind. The studies in the chemical and bacteriological weapons sphere are being conducted on a vast scale. Conventional-type weapons are beginning to become similar to mass destruction weapons in their characteristics.

The question is also not only one of "old" hotbeds of aggression being preserved, but of new ones arising as well. An example of the former is primarily the Middle East, where Israel's aggression against the Arab people still continues. What is more, the United States has become a direct

participant in the war and a direct military ally of Tel Aviv. The troops of a number of West European countries have also been drawn into military operations in Lebanon.

The threat of the conflict widening is assuming ever more tangible forms. At the same time, the provocations against Angola by the South African racist regime, which enjoys the patronage of the United States and NATO, and interference by imperialist forces in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and Kampuchea, still continue.

A primary example of the "new" hotbeds of aggression is Central America. In the autumn of 1983, Grenada was subjected to aggression which was in no way provoked, and is now occupied by the United States. The undeclared war against Nicaragua by Washington and Central American dictatorial regimes (which are now, at the initiative of the United States, in the process of forming a military bloc) is assuming an ever greater scale. American interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador is underway.

All this rightly troubles people in all four corners of the earth. One can say that world politics has now invaded every home and every family. Professional politicians have obviously now forever lost their "customary" monopoly on discussing and predicting the complex processes developing in the world, which are deeply contradictory in their very essence. These processes have become the object not only of the attention, but also of the actions of the popular masses.

How could it happen that the detente that was reached at the expense of great effort has now been replaced by confrontation and, the main thing; who bears the responsibility for all that has happened and for the growing threat of war? Various answers are given to these questions, and at times they are mutually exclusive. This is understandable: In a world divided into social systems which are mutually opposed in essence, and in a world of the bitterest social clashes, the problems of war and of averting it, including the problem of responsibility for the existing dangerous situation, cannot but be the object of the bitterest class and ideological struggle.

Imperialist propaganda claims that the responsibility for the present tension is supposedly borne by socialism, and primarily by the Soviet Union, which appears as "the focus of evil" and as the source of all mankind's serious problems. This stand is not new--basically, it has existed as long as socialism. However, today it is presented with truly unprecedented bitterness.

The responsibility of the ruling circles in Washington and of its closest allies for the present state of affairs in the world is more and more frequently admitted in liberal-bourgeois circles both in the United States and especially in Western Europe. However, they are inclined to regard the policy of the Soviet Union, which, they say, has "upset" the military balance in Europe, "invaded" Afghanistan, and so forth and so on, as the main cause of tension in this respect.

The point of view according to which the responsibility for the tension rests equally with both sides--both socialism and imperialism, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the USSR and the United States--is current in a certain section of democratic society, including among some detachments of the antiwar movement. This is a manifestation of the typical petty bourgeois approach, the essence of which basically lies in trying to avoid precisely defining one's own place in the all-embracing struggle of two lines and two political courses that has developed in the world arena.

Echoes of this stand have also been noted among the ranks of the communist movement. Thus, some comrades have claimed that the real cause of the tension is supposedly the rivalry of two great powers allegedly pursuing their own hegemonist aims. In other words, the causes of the aggravation of the situation have been reduced to a clash between the USSR's and the U.S.' "superpower interests."

To this it has been frequently added that, quote, in the middle of the seventies, the Soviet Union did not make use of all the available opportunities for strengthening detente, and that it undertook "imprudent" actions which "irritated" imperialism and "forced" it to adopt a course of confrontation.

It is true that these kind of motives have recently been repeated less frequently. Those very same comrades who advanced these motives now emphasize that responsibility for the present state of affairs rests "primarily" with imperialism (let us note that the word "primarily" remains). And the number of advocates of the thesis of the "equal responsibility" of socialism and capitalism for the exacerbation of the international situation has been reduced to a certain extent within the antiwar movement. This is completely natural. With every passing day, socialism's foreign policy provides even more convincing evidence of the genuine peacefulness of the USSR and its allies. At the same time, the U.S. policy convinces even many diehards of the fact that the real guilty party responsible for the growth of tension is precisely Washington.

Everyone who is really striving to preserve peace is called upon to most actively participate in the struggle for the truth and for the right answer to the question about the real state of affairs within the present international crisis.

Only Marxist-Leninist theory, and primarily the Leninist teaching about imperialism and the contemporary era and the international relations characteristic of it, can provide the sole correct and scientific answer to this question, an answer that provides a reliable key to understanding the existing situation by ensuring objectivity and a clear class approach.

It should be taken into account that an analysis of the present international crisis has not only political and ideological, but also theoretical and world outlook significance. In our opinion, this kind of research makes it possible to continue, while taking new phenomena into account, the Marxist-Leninist study of the main trends of social development and of the development of two systems in the conditions of the growth of socialism's force and influence and its achievement of military-strategic parity with imperialism.

The present international crisis is not an isolated phenomenon. As is well-known, international relations, according to K. Marx' definition, pertain to the category of "secondary and tertiary," generally "derived," "transferred," and "non-primary production relations."¹ Naturally, in the final analysis, their development reflects the nature of the development of production relations in the contemporary world.

The main specific feature of our era, which was opened by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is the coexistence, to use the words of V.I. Lenin, of two systems of ownership, or two social systems. International relations in the contemporary era are correspondingly based not on some unified system of production relations, but on two such systems--socialist and capitalist--each of which develops according to its own laws. Consequently, these relations reflect, first, the general dynamics of the development of productive forces and production relations in the socialist world; second, the corresponding dynamism in the capitalist world; and third, the interaction of socialism and capitalism, and the nature and particular features of the relations between them at each given stage of historical development.

The core of international relations and the main direction of their development after the Great October Socialist Revolution was the struggle between the two opposite world systems, socialism and capitalism. V.I. Lenin was the first to call attention to this circumstance.

"...The mutual relations between peoples and the entire world system of states are determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia,"² V.I. Lenin said in 1920. In this connection, he attached the foremost importance for opening up the mutual relations between the two systems to the correlation of forces on the world scene. V.I. Lenin saw the prerequisite for working out a correct political line in a sober and strictly objective consideration of "ALL class forces of any given state (as well as of the state surrounding it, and of all states on a worldwide scale)."³ For this reason, the leader of the October Revolution devoted his tireless attention to the problem of comprehensively strengthening the position of socialism and of consolidating the international position of history's first socialist state. "The international position," he said, "...turns around the struggle of Soviet Russia with others, that is, the capitalist states. Strengthening Soviet Russia and making it invincible--this is the main thing...."⁴

In analyzing V.I. Lenin's precepts on the ways of strengthening the positions of socialism in its antagonism with capitalism on the world scene, it is impossible not to notice that he did not call attention to only one factor of some kind, but to the entire totality of various factors. They are primarily the following:

The need for fully realizing the potentials of the socialist system that opens the prospects for the society's unlimited progress;

A successful economic construction. "The struggle has been transferred to this sphere on a worldwide scale," V.I. Lenin said in 1921. "If we fulfill this task, then we will probably win definitely and finally on the worldwide scale as well. For this reason, the questions of economic construction have for us an absolutely extraordinary importance."⁵

Strengthening the military might of socialism for the defense of its achievements. "We could not exist without an armed protection of the socialist republic,"⁶ V.I. Lenin wrote. "...Whoever forgets the danger that constantly threatens us and that will not end as long as world imperialism exists, whoever forgets that also forgets our workers' republic."⁷

Foreign political activeness of socialism both in the sphere of pursuing the course of peaceful coexistence and developing economic relations with the capitalist countries⁸ and of supporting "democratic and revolutionary movements in any country and especially in colonies and dependent countries."⁹

In V.I. Lenin's opinion, the advance along all these directions should ensure favorable external conditions for building socialism. He emphasized that this represents the only basis for a successful struggle to free mankind from the yoke of capitalism and from the slaughter and maiming of tens of millions of people for the purpose of resolving the question of whether the British or the Germans, the Japanese or the Americans, or some other plunderers will prevail in dividing the world."¹⁰

The Leninist conclusions had the character of a theoretical analysis and of a practical program of efforts to strengthen socialism and its positions on the world scene. It is precisely from these conclusions that our party and the fraternal communist and workers parties of socialist countries have proceeded and continue to proceed in their revolutionary transforming activity.

It is precisely these conclusions whose correctness has been demonstrated by the entire course of history that inspired the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the November (1982), June and December (1983), and Extraordinary February (1984) Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, which defined the course toward more fully opening up and utilizing the advantages of socialism as a social system, accelerating the country's development, increasing its might and defense capability, and comprehensively raising the standard of living of the Soviet people.

History has confirmed that the successful development of socialism, the growth of its economic and defense might, and its political activeness have become the main factor of the correlation of forces on the international scene changing to the advantage of peace and progress. Since 1917, imperialism has lost its monopolist position in the world and ceased to be the only social system in the world. Its decline has begun.

After 1945, an entire complex of socialist states arose side by side with the Soviet Union. This represented a major change in the correlation of forces that in many respects necessitated the subsequent collapse of the colonial system. However, at the beginning, the community of socialism was still inferior to the imperialist opponent according to its economic and military might.

However, on the boundary between the sixties and seventies, the fundamental turn to the advantage of socialism became clear. It was the result of the successes of the socialist countries in building the new society that is now entering a higher stage of advance along the path of progress. The USSR is solving the tasks of perfecting developed socialism. This process is either in progress or is beginning in other countries of the community. The restructuring of the society on socialist principles is being completed in a number of states. The economic cooperation between the socialist states is assuming a qualitatively new character.

Under these conditions, much is changing--both in essence and in form--in the historic creativity of the peoples of the fraternal states. For, the socialist world is leaving behind the period when it lived on the basis inherited from the past. It is building and, in our country, it has already built, its own basis of development. Under these conditions, all problems appear in a new way. Life had demonstrated that this period has proved to be objectively very complex and that quick and correct solutions cannot be found for all problems by far. Thus, the new society must determine the ways of finding the true socialist solutions for the tasks of effectively developing all aspects of production at a high level of quality, without any example to follow, for the first time in history. A certain inertia, the habit of old forms and methods of work, conservatism, passiveness, and a shortage of constructive initiatives hinder the progress at times.

However, the CPSU and other fraternal parties of the countries of socialism are finding the correct solutions for the problems that arise. The economic and political might of the socialist community continues to confidently grow.

In the economic sphere, the states of the socialist community, which account for more than one third of the world's industrial production, have reached the level at which they surpass the capitalist world in any of the three main centers of its power.

The measures on increasing the effectiveness and qualitative level of production, perfecting the system of economic management, and activating the participation of the working masses in its functioning that are now being taken in the USSR and a majority of other countries of socialism should ensure the further progress of the economy. The results of the economic development of the USSR and of other fraternal countries in 1983 provide sufficiently convincing evidence of this.

According to the available calculations, in the immediate future, the annual rate of growth of the national income of the states of the socialist community will be between 5 and 7 percent. This rate is considerably higher than the rate on which the developed capitalist countries can count.

The planned measures on perfecting socialist economic integration should play a considerable role in the sphere of solving such problems common to the CEMA countries as those of the technological reequipment of production, the efficient utilization of resources, the preparation and introduction of new technical equipment and materials, the raising of the quality of production to the level of world standards, and the fullest satisfaction of the working people's demand for high quality goods. The data on the development of the national economies of the countries of socialism convincingly show that, in the economic sphere, the correlation of forces will continue to change to the advantage of socialism.

In the military-strategic sphere, the parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO achieved at the beginning of the seventies represented a major success of socialism. "The military-strategic equilibrium between socialism and imperialism objectively contributes to peaceful coexistence," Yu.V. Andropov noted. "The achievement of this equilibrium is one of the most important results achieved in recent decades. It has demanded considerable efforts and resources of our people and the peoples of other countries of the socialist community and we will not allow it to be broken. We will further continue to do everything necessary to ensure the security of our country and of our friends and allies and will continue to further increase the combat strength of the Soviet Armed Forces, the powerful factor of containing the aggressive aspirations of imperialist reaction."¹¹

It is sometimes said that defending the necessity of parity allegedly means striving to preserve the current very high level of the arms race. This is not so at all. For, first, setting the question of parity, the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries thereby strive to put an end to the arms race. And, second, as is known, at the same time they are striving to achieve a real and sizeable reduction in arms, that is, not raising, but considerably lowering the level of the opposite military positions." "The Soviet people," K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his speech to voters on 2 March 1984, "do not want an increase in weapons but rather a reduction on both sides."¹²

Of course, in cases where imperialism adopts measures to break the existing military-strategic parity, the countries of socialism cannot but restore this parity. So it has happened recently in Europe in particular. The deployment of new American nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries has compelled the countries of socialism to adopt countermeasures, neutralizing the new threat of a military nature thus created and restoring parity. Of course, these countermeasures are maintained strictly within those bounds dictated by the actions of the NATO countries.

Finally, on a political-diplomatic plane, the initiative in the world arena is invariably held by the countries of socialism, the socialist community, and the Soviet state. It is precisely they which have made an impressive sum of proposals that show humanity the way forward to stable and peaceful coexistence. The program of peace drawn up and implemented by the CPSU is by no means a "document that has been written off," as some claim in the West.

On the contrary, one can note with satisfaction that the broadest social forces and many states, political parties, and organizations are now inspired in their activities by those ideas that were first put forward by the CPSU.

Despite active opposition from the West, many of our proposals have nevertheless been adopted and embodied in interstate documents of great principled significance. One can say with certitude that all of the most major foreign political actions of recent years--from the Helsinki Final Act to a series of agreements aimed at limiting the arms race--have been the result of foreign political initiatives on the part of the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community.

In this respect, the results of the 38th session of the UN General Assembly, which adopted a series of important resolutions aimed at preventing a nuclear war and at stopping the arms race, are indicative. The authors or co-authors of these resolutions were the countries of socialism. And they received the overwhelming majority of votes. The United States and its allies found themselves cast in an isolation that was far from resplendent.

The influence of socialism as a most important factor of peace and progress has significantly increased. Naturally, in speaking of this, we in no way rule out the great role that the countries of Asia and Africa, liberated from the colonial yoke, many Latin American states, the international workers movement, and other democratic and anti-imperialist forces have played and continue to play in the contemporary world. However, the scientific analysis of any social process presupposes the singling out of the main, decisive factor. This factor is the growth of world socialism and its comprehensive strengthening. Incidentally, in many ways the potential of other peace-loving forces are also revealed precisely under the influence of socialism and with its support. At one time V.I. Lenin wrote: "...the fact that a country has appeared that has resisted world imperialism for 3 years has considerably changed the international situation throughout the whole world..."¹³ Now, when it is no longer just one such country that exists and is successfully developing on this planet, but a whole system of socialist states, and when this system has become a powerful bastion of anti-imperialist struggle, the international situation could not but change even more considerably.

III

It is impossible to correctly understand all these changes without considering another important factor of world development--the continuing deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Qualitatively new features appeared in this sphere by the seventies.

The particular feature of the general crisis of capitalism is, as is well known, the fact that it is developing under the influence of the internal laws of the capitalist mode of production and of processes that are external with regard to capitalism, that is, primarily the appearance and development of socialism. There is no doubt that the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism in the seventies, as well as in the subsequent period, was in many ways also connected with the strengthening of the positions of socialism and with the process of the national and social liberation of the peoples

who were developing under socialism's objective influence. But, of course, the decisive role was played by the internal contradictions of capitalist society.

Some Marxist scientists have recently expressed the point of view that the time has now come to state the fact that the general crisis of capitalism is entering a qualitatively new stage. In our opinion, this is perhaps premature. However, it is clear that the contemporary stage of imperialism's development requires deepened study, since it is marked by a number of new phenomena.

As is well known, at the end of the sixties and beginning of the seventies, Marxist thinking came to the conclusion that the particular features of contemporary capitalism are explained to a considerable extent by the fact that it is adapting itself to the new situation in the world.

The corresponding conclusion was stated in the documents of the 1969 International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties. It was noted in particular that the monopolies have made extensive use of state regulation of the economy and the achievements of scientific-technical progress for strengthening their positions, increasing the effectiveness and rates of development of production, and intensifying the exploitation of the working people.¹⁴ This policy has ensured for capitalism certain advantages for some time. However, as the 24th CPSU Congress emphasized, it has not led and could not lead to the stabilization of capitalism as a system.

What is more, the adaptation of imperialism to the new situation and, in particular, the intensification of state-monopolistic trends and the utilization of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution have ultimately led to a deepening of the main fundamental contradictions in the capitalist mode of production. It is precisely on this basis that fundamentally new phenomena, affecting imperialism's productive forces, production relations, and superstructure, have arisen in imperialism's development during the last one and a half to two decades.

V.I. Lenin once pointed out that the trend engendered by the monopolies to slow down technical progress does not lead to the automatic collapse of capitalism through the "corking up" of its productive forces. He foresaw the possibility of those periods when, "as a whole, capitalism would grow immeasurably more rapidly than before..."¹⁵ In the fifties and sixties, as a result of the use of state-monopolistic regulation and the application of the achievements of science and technology, the growth of capitalism's productive forces was somewhat accelerated and, the main thing, those forces underwent a qualitative change. The technical base of industry, primarily in the developed countries, was renewed owing to the introduction of automation, and then of computer technology and robots.

The opportunity arose for resolving many problems facing mankind (for example, energy and ecological problems and so forth), and for satisfying the vital needs of the population. This did not happen, however. The fruits of the increased productive forces were utilized by the monopolies (and primarily by the monopolies working for war), whose rates of profit increases significantly exceeded the growth rates of production and of the national income.

Today the words of V.I. Lenin written by him as early as on the eve of World War I resound with particular denunciatory force: "Wherever one looks, at every step one encounters tasks which mankind is fully able to fulfill IMMEDIATELY. Capitalism stands in the way.... Civilization, freedom, and wealth under capitalism put one in mind of a rich man who has guzzled himself and who is rotting alive and prevents that which is young from living."¹⁶

The changes in capitalism's productive forces have entailed further changes in its production relations, too. These changes have progressed in the very direction predicted by V.I. Lenin. The question is primarily one of the further monopolization of production and of the concentration of society's wealth in the hands of a dwindling number of giant industrial-financial groups and associations. This process has developed both within the framework of every imperialist country taken individually and, what is particularly important, on an international scale. The internationalization of capitalist production and trade was particularly clearly reflected in the rapid development and strengthening of the positions of the transnational corporations, which, at the beginning of the eighties, accounted for approximately 40 percent of industrial production and 60 percent of the foreign trade of the capitalist world, and approximately 80 percent of developed technology.¹⁷

While analyzing the trends of imperialism's economic development, V.I. Lenin noted the pronounced contradictory nature of its consequences. With the passage of time, the conditions are objectively formed under which "some basic properties of capitalism begin to turn into their opposite."¹⁸ What V.I. Lenin primarily had in mind was the fact that imperialism "leads in real earnest to the most comprehensive socialization of production..."¹⁹ In other words, the strengthening of the positions of monopolistic capital and the further growth of its concentration and centralization create the fundamental prerequisites for "a period of transition from capitalism to a higher socioeconomic structure."²⁰

In our time, the gigantic growth of the monopolies, which has been increased by the progressive development of state-monopolistic trends, makes production truly social. But the properties of this production, including the owners of the huge production complexes which no longer supply just one country, but whole groups of states and even the whole capitalist world, are still a small group of multi-millionaires. Hence the unprecedented deepening of capitalism's main contradiction--the contradiction between the social nature of the productive forces and the private-ownership nature of production relations. Even bourgeois economists are more and more frequently forced to admit the existence and acuteness of this contradiction. However, the main thing is that this contradiction leads to the growing instability of the capitalist economy. A series of economic crises, which marked the seventies and the beginning of the eighties, have clearly shown: The narrow framework of contemporary capitalism's production relations is even less able to ensure it at least somewhat stable economic growth.

With any fluctuations in production, and even when production is on the rise, massive unemployment still continues, the disorder in the international monetary and financial system is intensified, and the economic contradictions between the various capitalist countries and their groups become more and more

acute. "Contradictions within the imperialist system are being aggravated and the struggle for markets and for raw material and energy sources is becoming more intense. The Japanese and West European monopolies are competing with American capital more and more successfully, including in the U.S. domestic market," the 26th CPSU Congress noted.

The further monopolization of production also causes an increasingly sharp social differentiation of society. The number of the poor, homeless, illiterate, and discriminated against is increasing in all the capitalist countries, and above all, in the United States. This shows with particular force imperialism's inability to deal with the social consequences of the scientific-technical revolution, which dooms millions and millions of working people to unemployment and poverty. As a result, an ever greater quantity of socially explosive material is accumulating in the countries of the capitalist world.

In other words, as V.I. Lenin foresaw, the development of imperialism does not lead to a concealment of social contradictions (of which right-wing revisionist and liberal-bourgeois theoreticians have dreamed and continue to dream), but to their further exacerbation. The antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and between the monopolies and all the people, is deepening. And indeed, today both these contradictions are becoming more acute and sometimes engender spontaneous but very deep social conflicts which draw into their orbit even those strata of society still recently considered inert and incapable of action.

Let us take the end of the sixties, for example.

The stormy events of May 1968 in France, the "hot fall" in Italy, and the actions of the blacks and youth in the United States testified to the direct and acute sociopolitical clash of the working people with the whole system of power of monopolistic capital. At the end of the seventies and beginning of the eighties, purely political problems, and primarily the problem of war and peace, were already at the center of the antagonism between the monopolies and the people. This antagonism took the form of open and active protest by the masses against the policies of the capitalist governments.

The changes taking place within the political superstructure of contemporary capitalism are also closely connected with these processes. "The political superstructure above the new economy and above monopolistic capitalism," wrote V.I. Lenin, "...is a turn AWAY FROM democracy TOWARD political reaction.... "Political reaction suits the monopolies."²¹

In our time, capitalism's political superstructure is acquiring an ever more reactionary nature on the basis of combining the strength of the monopolies with the strength of the state. The structure and functioning of state authority, the legislative system, and the repressive apparatus are adapting themselves more and more strongly to the requirements of an antinational and antiworker policy.

Now, of course, in the conditions of the significant growth and increasing activeness of the forces opposing the monopolies, imperialism is compelled to mask its real intentions and actions more carefully. In actual fact, never before has the anti-national nature of capital's domination been so obvious as now. But, at the same time, never before has so much been said about the "All-national" nature of the bourgeois state, which supposedly serves the interests of the "whole nation."

The deepest contradiction between the orientation of the contemporary bourgeois state, on the one hand, and the society's real needs and the nation's real interests, on the other, together with growing pressure and arbitrariness of the monopolies, engender increasing crisis phenomena at all levels of the capitalist superstructure. This is evident both within the sphere of politics and the spheres of ideology, morals, and culture.

In this very way, V.I. Lenin's forecast of comprehensive nature of imperialism's decline is confirmed. Today, even bourgeois politicians and scientists who can by no means be called progressive are forced to admit: The imperialist system is experiencing a profound crisis from top to bottom. Comparisons between the present stage of capitalism's development and the last period of the Roman Empire's existence, the period of its decline and decay, are becoming more and more frequent.

The conclusion drawn by the 1960 International Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties that, at the present stage, the deepening of the crisis of capitalism will take place precisely in a situation of peace, in a situation of competition between two systems, and as a result of profound social changes in the international arena in favor of the forces of peace and democracy, has proved to be completely correct.²² In this way the theses of leftist "theoreticians," who have predicted that in the conditions of peace the development of the crisis of capitalism will supposedly slow down, have been refuted. The claims made by bourgeois ideologists to the effect that measures adopted in the fifties and sixties would ensure the stabilization of capitalism and give it new stability have likewise come to grief. On the eve of the seventies, leading representatives of bourgeois futurology predicted a "decade of flourishing," practically the beginning of a new "golden age" for capitalism. Now this kind of utterance is not heard. Conclusions of a very gloomy tone have taken their place.

Here, for example, is the opinion of the IMF: "It became clear during the seventies that the traditional macroeconomic measures adopted by governments with the aim of stabilizing their economies were not yielding, so it seemed, any results. Earlier, a tougher budget and currency policy had made it possible to cope with inflation and to slow down the difficulties of the economy, while measures to stimulate production had made it possible to reduce unemployment and to renew economic activeness. Now, the stimulation of production is increasing inflation without increasing employment, while a tough economic policy is increasing unemployment without reducing inflation." The capitalist economy has been characterized by IMF specialists as "a ship that has strayed off course."

In the appraisal of the last decades of the development of capitalist society at the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee Plenum it was noted: "...We are witnesses to the considerable deepening of the general crisis of this social system. The methods with the aid of which capitalism managed to maintain the relative stability of its development in the postwar period are losing their effectiveness more and more.... Imperialism has become entangled in internal and interstate antagonisms, shocks, and conflicts."²³

IV

Imperialism's initial reaction to the changed situation in the world at the beginning of the seventies was its forced agreement to international detente. Basically, detente objectively signified a step toward the Western leaders acknowledging the real state of affairs existing in the world arena, and their admission of the fact that imperialism "was no longer able either to cancel out the historical achievements of socialism or to stop the continued advance of progressive forces or the movement for the liberation and independence of peoples."²⁴ In other words, detente signified imperialism's retreat from the frontiers it had traditionally occupied. However, this retreat was strictly forced. As U.S. President R. Nixon and his closest collaborators emphasized at the beginning of the seventies, there simply remained no other way out for the West at that time, since it had lost its supremacy--primarily on the military-strategic plane--with regard to socialism. "We must admit that not one major power can gain a decisive advantage over the other," the U.S. President stated in 1971, "Consequently, at the present moment there exists no alternative to negotiations." "We are compelled to coexist," he said in another place.

However, while grudgingly agreeing to detente, imperialism, naturally, proceeded in this respect from its own calculations. Now, when many documents, memoirs, and research papers have been published which relate to the seventies, one can already completely clearly conceive that these calculations amounted to the following:

First, to gain time in order to prepare themselves in every possible way and make a fresh attempt to change the correlation of world forces in their favor. Having declared a transition from "the era of confrontation to the era of negotiations," R. Nixon emphasized at the same time that he would definitely try to "restore the incontestable American military supremacy over the Soviet Union." In accordance with this, his administration, and then the G. Ford administration, signed documents on detente while simultaneously adopting decisions that laid the foundation for the present, particularly dangerous spiral of the arms race. Thus, at the beginning of the seventies, work was begun on building the Trident submarine and the corresponding missiles; the MX intercontinental missile; the Pershing II and intermediate-range cruise missiles; and the B-1 bomber.

During the same years, active preparations of new plans for both a "limited" and a "global" war against the USSR were simultaneously underway ("Memorandum on the Adoption of Decisions in the Sphere of National Security" and other documents relating to 1974).

Second, the West's calculations also consisted in the fact that, in conditions when contacts between the countries were expanding and mutual economic and cultural exchanges were being activated, new possibilities were opening up for influencing the policies of the socialist countries with the aim of changing these policies in a direction necessary to imperialism. H. Kissinger, for example, stated completely clearly on the eve of the seventies: "...The aim of American policy is to assist a favorable change in Soviet society,... and to ensure a domestic political turn in the Soviet Union." Z. Brzezinski later concretized this "aim" thus: "If detente must be something greater than transient and basically unstable relations, if it must be, as one would imagine, all-embracing, then this is achievable only if there is a perhaps slow but fundamental turn in Soviet domestic and foreign policy." First the doctrines of "laying bridges" and "converging" were used to achieve precisely this aim, and later it was the slogan of the struggle for "human rights," which was used to substantiate the support for and encouragement to all forces hostile to socialism.

Further, imperialism's calculation consisted in the fact that, as it was supposed in the West, detente would make it possible to stop the revolutionary struggle in the world (under the slogan of "extending" peaceful coexistence to relations between antagonistic classes and between the oppressors and the oppressed), but the main thing was that it would make it possible to end socialism's aid to fighters for national and social liberation. It was emphasized in the collective research of a group of seasoned anticommunists headed by R. Pipes and R. Conquest, for example, that detente would be acceptable for the West only if the countries of socialism were to renounce their support for the forces of national and social liberation.²⁵

Finally, it was presupposed that achieving all the aforementioned aims would make it possible to "bring order" to the Western world itself, and, in particular, to mitigate the acuteness of the inner imperialist contradictions and crisis situations. This end was to have been served by the formation of the "Trilateral Commission," (June 1973), which intended to improve "international cooperation, which is particularly necessary now when democracy in the United States, Europe, and Japan is undergoing a serious crisis." The same task was also set the traditional (since the end of 1975) conferences of the highest leaders of leading powers in the capitalist world.

One detail is revealing: Detente (as it is seen in the West) has been characterized more than once in NATO publications as "a continuation of the cold war by other means."

But the real results of detente have turned out to be very different from those hoped for by the leading circles in the imperialist countries. First of all, their calculation that socialism would be undermined from within and that the unity of the socialist community would be destroyed fell through. Of course, if detente had been continued, and if it could have been extended to the military sphere, and if the arms race were stopped, the countries of socialism would have been able to achieve still greater results. But even being limited and incomplete, detente has shown: In the conditions of the strengthening of peaceful coexistence, socialism is given additional possibilities to develop.

At the same time, since detente signified a certain retreat of imperialism's most reactionary and aggressive circles from the proscenium of political life, it facilitated the liberation struggle of the forces of social progress.

It was precisely during the years of detente that major social changes of a progressive nature took place in the world: A unified socialist Vietnam was formed; the last, Portuguese, colonial empire collapsed, in the place of which a series of independent and democratic states arose; and the fascist dictatorial regimes in Portugal, Greece, Spain, and so forth crashed.

"Detente," noted K.U. Chernenko, "is a multiplan, multimeasure process. Detente is indisputably the path to peace and cooperation. But not only this. The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that detente opens up scope for democratizing international life in general and increases the political activeness of the broadest masses. Detente is inseparable from recognition of the right of every people to independently decide its own fate and to choose its own way of life and direction of social development.

"It is hoped that the sociopolitical status quo can be preserved or "frozen"--this is a reactionary utopia and nothing more. And life has convincingly proved this."²⁶

Detente has also not brought about the consolidation, so desired by Washington, of the foundations of American hegemony in the capitalist world. On the contrary, at the beginning of the seventies, the tendency to relatively greater independence on the part of the United States' NATO allies revealed itself. Then the West began to talk very loudly of the crisis of "Atlantic solidarity."

Finally, on an economic plane, the years of detente were likewise far from marked by the stabilization and "recovery" of the capitalist economy. What is more, a series of cyclical and structural crises in the seventies and eighties seriously undermined the mechanism of its functioning. The U.S. military-industrial complex was clearly alarmed, thinking that its positions at the beginning of the seventies, especially after the failure of the American aggression in Vietnam, had been weakened to a certain extent. Detente, and especially real steps along the path to arms reduction, were irreconcilably at variance with the very conditions of the existence and prosperity of the military-industrial complex.

All this taken as a whole was regarded by the most reactionary and conservative circles in the West, and particularly in the United States, as a dangerous challenge. The conclusion drawn was simple: It is time to put an end to detente, it is time to return to confrontation.

It was precisely under this slogan that the activities of the "new right-wing" movement which had formed in the United States by the middle of the seventies developed. A mass of organizations formed by it, among the most influential of which were the National Conservative Political Action Committee (which later played a leading role in R. Reagan's election campaign), and also the Committee on Present Danger, in the activities of which the future president of the United States participated from 1977, appeared in the country's political arena.

The "crusade" policy signified that imperialism including primarily American imperialism, had shifted from the strategy of adaptation to the strategy of forcibly changing the situation. The most aggressive circles of imperialism have indeed set themselves an unattainable goal, the goal of erecting a barrier on the path of progressive changes in the world and of recapturing for themselves the role of the ruler of the destinies of peoples.

And in this connection it is impossible not to recall V.I. Lenin's statement that, striving to intensify the confrontation with socialism the imperialists are thereby "struggling to artificially postpone the downfall of capitalism."²⁷

In the middle and latter half of the seventies, the USSR as well as its allies spared no effort to strengthen detente and its advance and, in particular, its extension to the military sphere. In the middle of the seventies, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries made scores of proposals concerning the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons, the reduction of conventional weapons, primarily in central Europe, and the liquidation of entire types of weapons (for instance, the chemical and radiological ones). These proposals were incorporated in the Peace Program put forward by the 25th CPSU Congress (in 1976). The contacts and negotiations were initiated between the USSR and the United States on many acute problems, in particular on the problems of limiting and, subsequently, reducing military activities in the Indian Ocean region, the problems concerning the limitation of arms trade, on completely stopping the nuclear tests, and banning the development of anti-satellite weapons. The Soviet Union was prepared to move toward agreements on all of these problems, naturally, on the basis of the principle of parity and equal security. However, from the very beginning, Washington procrastinated and sabotaged the negotiations in progress and then unilaterally broke them off.

There is no shortage of claims according to which the Soviet Union allegedly provided the motive for aggravating the situation by taking a number of "imprudent" actions. What is involved in this connection is the fact that, just as previously, in the seventies, the USSR had continued to follow its course of supporting the national liberation and progressive forces and movements. This line is at times presented as a manifestation of "expansionism" or "export of the revolution." Both of these claims are a gross lie. In extending its support to the forces of progress, the USSR has not sought and seeks no advantages or privileges for itself. It has never built and is not building any military bases, it has made no capital investments anywhere to derive income from them, it has not seized sources of raw materials in other countries, and it has imposed no political conditions on the latter. Then what kind of "expansionism" is involved in this connection?

As regards the speculation in connection with the "export of the revolution," it is known everywhere that the Soviet Union has never organized or "instigated" a single revolution. The revolutions are the result of the natural course of events, a result of the development of internal contradictions of capitalism and colonialism in the respective countries of the world. The revolutions of the seventies, just like the preceding revolutions, were prepared, initiated, and carried out by the peoples

aspiring to freedom. However, when dangers began to threaten these revolutions and when they were subjected to aggressive attacks by the United States and other imperialist states, the Soviet Union naturally came to their aid. This assistance was fully in accord with the principles incorporated in the UN Charter and other international documents of the postwar period which recognize the legitimacy of the right of peoples to independently determine their fate and, in contrast, proclaim as unlawful any attempts to interfere with any means in the fulfillment of this right. The USSR and its allies extended their assistance to the revolutionary forces only in response to the actions of imperialism.

It is quite natural that socialism's support for the revolutionary achievements of such countries as Angola, Ethiopia, and Afghanistan "irritated" imperialism. This is not surprising because their plans to return the aforementioned countries to the bosom of neocolonial dependence have failed. The policy of supporting the struggle of peoples for their freedom, followed by the countries of socialism, has and does fully correspond to the interests of the consolidation of peace. As K.U. Chernenko remarked at the Extraordinary Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on behalf of the cause of peoples--this is also necessary and important today for the direction of the struggle for a stable peace in the world."

V

The turn of imperialism toward promoting tension cannot be understood without taking into account such an important circumstance--important in principle--as the unprecedented growth of the role of militarism in the life of the capitalist society in recent decades.

Analyzing the essence of imperialism, V.I. Lenin emphasized as early as at the beginning of the century: "Militarization now permeates the entire social life. Imperialism is a fierce struggle between big powers for the division and partition of the world, and for this reason it must necessarily lead to a further militarization in all countries, including the neutral and the small ones."²⁸ He wrote: "...imperialism that is, the monopolistic capitalism, which finally and definitely matured only in the 20th century, is distinguished, in its fundamental ECONOMIC characteristics, by the lowest level of peaceableness and of devotion to freedom and by the greatest development of the military everywhere." And he added: "The failure to notice this... means falling to the level of a most ordinary lackey of the bourgeoisie."²⁹

The growth of militarism as an economic and social phenomenon is stimulated by the transformation of the military-industrial complex into a most important component part of the monopolist capital; by the internationalization of this complex, which is essentially becoming transnational; and by the intensification of the state monopolist trends contributing to strengthening the ties between monopolies, the military, and the most reactionary wing of political forces.

It goes without saying that the growth of militarism has been provoked by imperialism's intention to weaken and undermine the world of socialism by any means; by the expansionist strategy of financial capital, above all American

capital, and by its aspirations to consolidate its positions in the former colonial world; and by the deepening class contradictions in the capitalist world and the policy of the leading capitalist groups aimed at providing guarantees for themselves in the event of possible revolutionary shocks. Of course, what is also apparent in this connection is that it is hoped to overcome the increasing economic difficulties through a militarization of the economy; and to strengthen the positions of each of the three power centers (the United States, Japan, and Western Europe) under the conditions of an intensifying competition among them. It is by means of the arms race that the United States plans to tie its competitors more firmly to itself and weaken their opposition to the dictates of the American capital.

Analyzing the essence of imperialism, V.I. Lenin demonstrated that this is a monopolist capitalism, a parasitic capitalism, and a dying capitalism. Militarism most strikingly reflects all these characteristics and traits.

Militarism, together with the four main aspects of monopoly singled out by V.I. Lenin (the monopoly resulting from a concentration of production; the monopoly resulting from the seizure of the sources of raw materials; the monopoly resulting from banking operations; and the monopoly resulting from colonial policy) has now essentially become the fifth main aspect of monopoly. This fact has found its expression in the formation of military-industrial complexes in all the main capitalist countries.

The appearance of the military-industrial complexes reflects a new stage in the monopolization of production and even further deepens the monopolist essence of contemporary imperialism.

The military expenditures of the capitalist countries now amount to a total that exceeds the gross national product of all African countries 1.5 times. They are approximately equal to the gross national product of all Latin American countries. Some 5 to 10 percent of the basic types of raw materials and 20 to 40 percent of the most valuable and rare types of these materials are now used for military purposes. Approximately 60 million people, including an enormous part of the most highly skilled specialists, are now employed in the military sphere (throughout the world). More than 500,000 people, or 20 percent of all scientific workers, taken away from work in the vitally important branches of peaceful production, are now engaged in the scientific research and studies in the same sphere.

Of course, imperialism still has considerable reserves at its disposal. But its insolvency has already revealed itself in a number of aspects. Now even the people who stand very far from the ideas of communism admit that a system that has created a mortal threat to the existence of mankind and which is seeking salvation for itself by preparing a catastrophe that could destroy the entire civilization is truly obsolete.

It is no accident at all that the United States has become the leader of militarism and a country where the militarization of society has reached the highest degree. In his time, V.I. Lenin characterized American imperialism

as the "freshest," as the "strongest," and the very last one participating in the imperialist struggle for the share of profits. "The American billionaires, these modern slave owners," Lenin wrote, "have opened a particularly tragic page in the bloody history of bloody imperialism."³⁰ The present deeds of the U.S. Administration are convincing proof of the correctness of the Leninist appraisal.

American imperialism in our time is, so to say, the "highest achievement" of imperialism, the highest point of its development. Just as capitalism in England was the classical capitalism of the 19th century, today U.S. imperialism is the classical imperialism of our time.

This is a worldwide exploiter octopus, unprecedented in history, which more and more lives from plundering other countries, including both the developed and developing ones. Finally, this is the best illustration of the fact that imperialism is a dying system. The incessant economic shocks and the deep political and moral crisis compel even American researchers to conclude that this system is truly outdated. In his book "The Zero-Sum Society," L. Thurow, professor of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, writes: "Our entire society is full of unhealthy, chronic, and alarming problems which cannot be solved by our political-economic system... Seeing our inability to solve these problems, many people reach the conclusion that the present American system has lost the moral ground for its existence."

All the aforementioned traits of American imperialism predetermines its special aggressiveness, make it the leader of the most reactionary forces of our time, and turn it into the source of a constant military threat to all of mankind.

The aforementioned doctrine of "crusade" against socialism is the fullest expression of this threat. This doctrine, an openly proclaimed program of a large-scale exportation of counterrevolution, is aimed at strengthening capitalism where it still exists and at restoring it where it has already been liquidated. This is a program of unlimited aggression and an open manifesto of the contemporary counterrevolution.

Some of our Western interlocutors try at times to convince us that the "programs" of this kind are nothing other than "rhetoric" and "only words" to which no particular attention should be paid.

However, the unprecedented bellicose declarations are certainly not just harmless rhetoric. They are embodied in perfectly concrete actions of the United States, the actions whose meaning and substance are widely known.

And these are the results of the implementation of the aforementioned policy.

A sharp exacerbation of international tension, activation of the arms race, increased military danger, and danger of a nuclear war. The deployment of American nuclear missiles in Western Europe has created an additional threat which is very serious from this point of view:

An activation of the forces of counterrevolution everywhere and uninterrupted attempts at exporting counterrevolution. American imperialism's attempts at interventions in order to suppress the liberation forces follow one after another. The exportation of counterrevolution, and the terrorism in relation to all peoples have become an inseparable part of U.S. state policy;

The stake of the most reactionary forces of the capitalist world in moving into a counteroffensive. It is apparent in the United States. It has found its expression in the election victories of the right-wing parties in Britain, the FRG, and Japan in recent years. It is also made apparent by the growth of the number of various neofascist and profascist organizations that now exist in 60 countries.

In the light of what has been said above, it is possible to make a substantiated conclusion about the question as to who is directly and immediately responsible for the present international crisis. The responsibility for it fully and completely falls on the shoulders of imperialism and primarily American imperialism.

There was also international tension and an arms race taking place at the beginning of our century. However, it was the competitive struggle of the imperialists that provided the basis for those developments. In the thirties, the tension and the arms race were primarily engendered by the "concerns" of the leading imperialist states over the partition of the world and of the spheres of influence. What was new then was the fact that both groups of imperialists, which were at loggerheads with each other, strived to resolve all their contradictions at the expense of socialism. Of course, contradictions between the imperialist states also exist today. However, it is precisely the social factor--the aspiration of imperialism to "replay" history, turn it back, and stop the social progress--that represents the motive force of the current exacerbation of tension on the international scene.

The sources of the current international crisis are closely connected with the very approach of imperialism to the nature and future prospects of mutual relations between the two systems. Imperialism refuses to reconcile itself to the legitimacy of the existence and strengthening of socialism. It continues to proceed from the view that socialism is a "historic anomaly" which must be liquidated.

There is no doubt that the existence of the two systems, their principled opposition to each other, and the irreconcilability of their ideologies are an objective fact. The entire question in this connection is how to approach this fact and what forms the antagonism between the two systems should assume. It is a well known truth that form is essential. And the form of antagonism between the two systems in the nuclear century is all the more essential.

Socialism proceeds from the necessity and the obligatory nature of peaceful coexistence of competition between the two social systems. "Transferring the ideological contradictions to the sphere of interstate relations has never brought anything good to anyone who resorted to this in external affairs," Yu.V. Andropov noted.

"And now, in the nuclear century, this is simply absurd and impermissible. Turning the antagonism between ideas into military antagonism would cost all mankind too much." Socialism is confident that, on the basis of a peaceful contest, its principles will inevitably triumph. It is convinced that precisely the conditions of peace provide the most favorable soil for the struggle of peoples for their rights and for social progress. And contrary to this, the aggressiveness of imperialism in our time precisely proceeds from the fact that it is not convinced of the triumph of its ideals under the conditions of peace and that it is not confident of its ability to oppose the forces of progress in any other way than by means of arms.

VI

We ask: What does mankind expect? Is it possible to change imperialism's approach to world affairs and force it to recognize reality and to renounce its orientation toward a military solution of contradictions between the two systems?

Although militarism and aggressive policy are closely related to the very nature of imperialism and represent its organic part, they do not make a world war inevitable in our time. The conclusion about its possible prevention, made by the CPSU and the entire communist movement in the fifties, continues to be fully valid. And what is more, under the present conditions, it is even more strongly grounded than in the past. The entire course of events in the most recent period confirms this.

First of all, it is absolutely obvious even now that the attempt at forcible pressure on the Soviet Union and the peoples of the socialist countries has not produced results.

Emphasizing that the "transition from capitalism to socialism represents an entire historical epoch," V.I. Lenin said: "As long as this epoch does not end, the exploiters will inevitably continue to nurture hopes for a restoration and these HOPES turn into ATTEMPTS at restoration."³¹ The change of imperialism to the policy of confrontation has been naturally marked by an activation of aspirations of this type. The attacks against the USSR, military pressures, economic boycott, and psychological warfare have continued to represent the basic direction of these aspirations. In this connection, leading American public officials have directly spoken about aspirations to achieve the liquidation of the "Soviet system."

By deploying its missiles in Europe, the United States has counted on making the Soviet Union "more tractable," forcing it to make concessions and undermining its security. These calculations have failed. The countermeasures adopted by the USSR and its allies have demonstrated that imperialism will not succeed in undermining the military-strategic equilibrium to its advantage, and that the attempts at talking to socialism in the language of force are doomed to failure. Our country, our people, and the peoples of other socialist countries have been, are, and always will be ready to repel the pressure of imperialism and to comprehensively rebuff it. The highly effective efforts of the socialist community to ensure its sufficient defense

have created the conditions in which, as K.U. Chernenko has said, "no fanciers of military adventures will succeed in taking us by surprise and no potential aggressor can hope to escape a crushing counterstrike."³²

The calculations of imperialism to economically "exhaust" socialism and, in particular, to undermine the Soviet economy by means of the arms race are also naive. But the hopes of this type are expressed here and there by some people in the West.

It is useful to remind these officials that, following the incredible destruction caused to our country by the Hitlerite invaders, the Soviet people not only fully restored but also multiplied their motherland's military and economic might in the shortest historical period. The vain attempts to undermine socialism are all the more futile today when socialism has grown into a great economic force.

During the period of the October Revolution, V.I. Lenin said: "...The American imperialists have lost their head and now, under the force of objective conditions, they are compelled to tackle a task to which they are no match...." Lenin had in mind the goal of crushing Soviet power and liquidating socialism which American imperialism had set for itself. And American imperialism is once again trying to take on a task which is equally beyond its strength. And once again, just as 6 decades ago, it will fail.

Facts testify that the pressures of imperialism on developing countries and the Nonaligned Movement are also failing to achieve their aims.

Despite all its efforts, Washington has failed to break the resistance of patriotic and progressive forces in the Middle East. The direct American intervention has provoked a growing concern not only in the Arab world, but also among U.S. allies. And the actions of the United States in Central America have resulted in a situation in which nearly the entire continent has actually united against it.

This enumeration could be further extended. It convincingly shows that the American exportation of counterrevolution to developing countries is encountering increasingly serious obstacles.

The conference of the Nonaligned Movement held in Delhi in the spring of 1983 and the activities of nonaligned countries at the 38th session of the UN General Assembly clearly show that the anti-imperialist potential of developing countries is not declining but, on the contrary, increasing despite the striving of imperialism to undermine it. The significant growth of the antiwar movement of the masses has turned into a serious obstacle on the path of the implementation of Washington's plans. This is a new phenomenon in world social development. A movement on such a scale and of such a depth, a movement uniting in its ranks such broad masses of people in all parts of the world has not appeared before, if you wish, during the entire history of mankind. The strength of this movement is in the fact that it unites in its ranks not just representatives of the democratic public and the progressive parties and mass organizations. The social democratic and

socialist parties, a number of parties and organizations of liberal and even conservative orientation, trade unions, religious organizations, and some individual public workers belonging to the ruling circles of Western countries participate in it.

The present antiwar movement does not just amount to some separate events, marches, and meetings, however impressive they may be. In Western Europe it has firmly entered the everyday life of every country. It is also impossible to disregard the mass actions against the danger of war in Japan and Australia.

The antiwar movement has great potential. If it is not yet able to impose its will on the respective governments, it most certainly plays the role of a growing barrier to the implementation of the most dangerous plans of these governments.

It is true that it is said at times that the antiwar movement is of a temporary nature, so to say, of the nature of a current demand. According to another viewpoint expressed by official Washington, it is the result of a "conspiracy of communists," if not a real branch of the communist movement.

The truth is that the contemporary antiwar movement is a natural reaction of peoples to the present stage of development of imperialism, the stage at which imperialism considers militarism and the arms race as a basic element of its policy. And this movement will continue to grow as long as the activities of Washington and its allies are based on a militarist course.

Of course, slumps and booms do occur and will continue to occur in the development of the antiwar movement. Of course, a certain contradiction is inherent to it because, by its social composition, it is heterogeneous, to say the least, as it extends to virtually all social strata ranging from the workers class to the individual representatives of monopolist capital.

At times, a parallel is drawn or a comparison made between the peace movement of the fifties and the present antiwar movement. It is beyond any doubt that the present movement is a continuation of the struggle for peace which took place in the past. But, at the same time, it is a new phenomenon. It unites within itself both emotions and reason, a realistic recognition of the threat of war, and a simultaneous growing understanding of the possibilities and ways of the struggle against this threat. Participants in the antiwar movement thoroughly understand the essence of foreign and military policies. They pose against the policy of imperialism a course of defense of peace which is wellthought out and carefully worked out, at times even in great detail.

The antiwar movement was born as an expression of the will and mood of the masses. But at the same time, it has become a factor of powerful influence on the will and mood of the masses, a factor of instilling antiwar awareness.

Soon after World War I, V.I. Lenin said that, in the situation after the October Revolution, the aspirations of people for peace would turn "from vague and weak expectations" into a "clear and precise political program

and active struggle of millions of people."³³ Today, this process has gone much further. Remembering the bitter lessons of the past world wars and taking into account the terrible dangers of the thermonuclear conflict, the people of the earth are demonstrating an increasingly firm will and struggling to ensure that a new tragedy will not be permitted. The consciousness of mankind and its concern for its own fate, these are the motive force of the present antiwar movement.

A prominent role in the development of the antiwar and anti-imperialist struggle is played by the communist movement. It is not surprising that the imperialist "power centers" are devoting ever closer attention to the question of the situation within the communist movement and of the ways of influencing it. It is characteristic, for example, that in April 1975 the question of "Eurocommunism" and its prospects were discussed at a meeting of the so-called Bilderberg [name as transliterated] club (an association of representatives of right-wing Western business and political circles). The same question was on the agenda of a meeting of the leaders of leading powers in the capitalist world held in London in May 1977. "I have emphasized for a number of years now," said Z. Brzezinski at that time in one of the interviews, "that as great a pluralization of Marxism as possible would meet the interests of stability of the United States and of international politics." The aim was obvious: To push Communists from their principled class positions to the path of renouncing their fundamental convictions, the correctness and force of which have been confirmed by history.

Although imperialism's anticommunist attacks have created additional problems for communists, it has not succeeded in achieving its aim. Communists have answered Washington's policy of confrontation and antinational actions with effective counteractions.

Communists were the first to stand up against the threat of nuclear war. By their own activities, they have shown how this struggle must be waged and have drawn up its program. Considering the real situation which exists in the world, the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee plenum advanced a thesis of exceptional importance both in terms of its content and dimensions: "Communists have always been fighters against the oppression and exploitation of man by man, and today they are also fighting for the preservation of human civilization and for man's right to life." A new interweaving of Communists' tasks in the sphere of social struggle and of their tasks in the struggle to preserve and strengthen peace has arisen.

In essence, this conclusion about the basic meaning of the activities of the communist movement in our time represents the further development of the thesis of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V.I. Lenin on the historical mission of the workers class. The Communists' antiwar struggle in our time, which is closely bound up with the struggle for social progress, is their decisive contribution to the cause of rebuffing the imperialist policy of confrontation. It is a new step forward along the path to implementing the historic mission of the workers class as a whole.

Washington's stubborn attempts to achieve the maximum cohesion of the Western world on the platform of the new "cold war" have also met with failure. All talks on the necessity of "restoring the moral authority of the United States" have concealed the hope of restoring the world supremacy of the United States and its hegemony with regard to both the developed capitalist and the developing countries.

In actual fact, Washington's policy has led to a considerable deepening of the differences and contradictions within the imperialist camp. Today there are not the usual debates and contradictions within the camp of imperialism. The present contradictions in the Western camp are not simply a matter of competition struggle, although this struggle is also intensifying. It is also not simply a case of a dispute over the methods of politics. The question is one of different approaches in principle to the question of the paths along which the struggle must be waged to preserve capitalism and to strengthen its positions.

The U.S. military-industrial complex proceeds primarily from striving to ensure for itself the greatest possible profits today. For the sake of this aim, it works towards increasing the military threat, and even the risk of nuclear war. At the same time, other groups of monopolistic capital, which are less closely bound up with the arms industry or which have (as a Western Europe) greater political experience and are aware of the seriousness of the threat of war, are of the opinion that a different path must be followed: A struggle to preserve capitalism and to safeguard its profits without bringing the matter to the direct danger of a large-scale military conflict arising. These more realistically-minded circles of the Western world, although perhaps inconsistently, nevertheless actually support the idea of peaceful coexistence.

There is no doubt that both one and the other groups proceed in their positions from the interests of capitalism. In the final analysis, both one and the other direct their efforts to the struggle against socialism. But, nevertheless, the difference in the conduct and intentions of both groups must be considered.

The Soviet Union and other countries of socialism express their readiness to achieve long-term peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries. The socialist states proceed from the view that this approach is in accord with the vital interests of peoples on both sides of the social barricade that divides the world. A realistic consideration of the contemporary international reality shows that we all have all the grounds for believing that the threat of a thermonuclear war is not fatal and that mankind is in a position to control this threat and ensure peace and security.

The concentrated actions of the forces and processes opposing the adventurist strategy of American imperialism have assumed such significant proportions and begun to take on such sharp forms that Washington has considered itself compelled to resort to certain maneuvers. A typical example of this was President Reagan's speech on 16 January 1984 which American propaganda tries to present as nearly a turnabout in U.S. policy. However, having spoken his words about a desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union, the President accompanied these words not with any kind of constructive proposals in this direction, but rather with calls to carry out a policy of force. No improvement of Soviet-American relations can be achieved on this basis.

Nevertheless, the very fact of his speech is symptomatic. Essentially it shows that the policy of confrontation pursued by the administration, the policy of forcible pressure on the Soviet Union is failing and not producing the desired results, and that this policy leads to a deterioration of the international position of the United States itself and to an intensification of its isolation in the world.

The nature of the present world situation is truly unique. This situation has come about for the first time in history. We often and correctly say that our era has a transitional character. Beginning with V.I. Lenin, the communists have been pointing out that considerable difficulties would be inherent to this era. It is now clear how great the problems engendered by it are and how intense the struggle for a real advancement of the cause of social progress is.

Imperialism as a whole is on the decline. Socialism is on the rise. Its forces are increasing.

Imperialism does not base its policy and its course in world affairs on a realistic consideration of the true trends of development of the society and the existing correlation of forces, but on vain calculations about restoring its lost positions and on the illusion that the course of history can allegedly be turned back. As W. Fulbright neatly put it as early as at the beginning of the seventies, "the anti-communist ideology has spared us the necessity of taking into account concrete facts and concrete situations. Our faith delivered us, just as their faith delivered the believers in the olden times, from the necessity of sober thinking...." The same thought, though already applied to the situation at the beginning of the eighties, was expressed by S. Wance and S. Hoffmann: "Our main task is to direct the American people and not the world of the fifties,"³⁴ The question is only when will the imperialist politicians prove themselves capable of making such a turn?

In its policy, socialism relies on reality and on an accurate consideration of the present state of affairs in the world and of the objective tendencies of its further evolution. The policy of socialism is a policy of sober realism. And for this reason the future belongs to it. Of course, an extraordinary activeness of the world of socialism, and primarily of the land of the soviets, will be needed to defend the rights and achievements of peoples and to curb the imperialist adventurism. "...The Leninist policy of peace, whose fundamental lines at the contemporary historical stage have been determined by the decisions of the recent CPSU congresses, corresponds to the vital interests of the Soviet people and, essentially, to the vital interests of other peoples of the world, too," K.U. Chernenko has stated. "And we resolutely declare: We will not deviate from the policy by a single step."³⁵

The historical mission of socialism in our time is not only to build the communist society, which is superior to capitalism in every respect. Its mission is also to save mankind from the threat of death in a nuclear war. And socialism will spare no effort to fulfill this noble historic mission with honor.

FOOTNOTES

1. "K. Marx and F. Engels Works," Vol 12, p 735.
2. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 41, p 242.
3. Ibid., p 47.
4. Ibid., Vol 42, p 124.
5. Ibid., Vol 43, p 341.
6. Ibid., Vol 38, p 138.
7. Ibid., Vol 42, p 173.
8. Ibid., Vol 40, p 152.
9. Ibid., Vol 36, p 76.
10. Ibid., Vol 44, p 135.
11. Yu.V. Andropov. "Selected Statements and Articles," Moscow 1983, p 298.
12. PRAVDA, 3 March 1984.
13. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 42, p 24.
14. "International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties," Moscow 1969, Prague, pp 17-18.
15. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 27, p 422.
16. Ibid., Vol 24, p 17.
17. "The Contemporary Transnational Corporations," Moscow, 1983.
18. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 27, p 385.
19. Ibid. p 320.
20. Ibid., p 385.
21. Ibid., Vol 30, p 93.
22. "Program Documents of the Struggle for Peace, Democracy, and Socialism," Moscow, 1961.
23. Yu.V. Andropov, "Selected Speeches and Articles," p 297.

24. "Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe," Berlin, 29-30 Jun 1976, Moscow, 1976.
25. "Survey," Spring-Summer 1974.
26. K.U. Chernenko, "Selected Speeches and Articles," Moscow, 1984.
27. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 26, p 383.
28. Ibid., Vol 30, p 137.
29. Ibid., Vol 37, p 248.
30. Ibid., p 48.
31. Ibid., p 264.
32. PRAVDA, 3 March 1984.
33. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 44, p 149.
34. S. Hoffmann, S. Wance, "Building the Peace: U.S. Foreign Policy for the Next Decade," Washington, 1982, p 181.
35. Documents of the Extraordinary Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, 13 February 1984, Moscow, 1984, pp 17-18.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

CSO: 1816/8 A-F

LIMITED NUCLEAR WAR CONCEPT, U.S. POLICY CRITICIZED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4,
Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 38-50

[Article by V. Kortunov: "Limited Nuclear War"--Strategy of Global Suicide"]

[Text] Among the numerous concepts prevalent across the Atlantic designed to "legitimize" the use of nuclear weapons as an "acceptable" means of achieving political goals, a special place has been occupied by the so-called "limited nuclear war" doctrine. Particularly great significance, perhaps, is imparted to this concept in both the military-political and propaganda planes. Both these aspects are closely interconnected.

It has long been known that truth is usually the first casualty of war. Any aggressor has always accompanied military operations and the preparation for war with the psychological indoctrination of the masses, fabricating this propaganda version or the other aimed at justifying an aggressive policy and portraying matters such that he is forced to "defend himself" against an outside threat or conduct a struggle in the name of "human ideals".

In our day imperialism's aggressive policy also is shrouded in a dense fog of disinformation and, as hundreds of years ago at the times of the "crusades," surrounded by a kind of messianic aura. The desire is to persuade the world public that it is by no means the expansionist aspirations of the American monopolies nor the interests of the military-industrial complex but the "sacred goal" of saving mankind from the "intrigues of communism" and the "Soviet threat"--this is the sole thing forcing the United States and other NATO countries to prepare for war.

Simultaneously American strategists' efforts are aimed at accustoming the peoples to the thought of the permissibility and inevitability even of nuclear war as something that is perfectly natural. The parallel task is being set also: playing down in every possible way the actual danger of a nuclear catastrophe and its scale and consequences and persuading people of the possibility of a "limited nuclear war," which, they say, is not as terrible as some people claim.

The "limited nuclear war" doctrine has, of course, more than just an exclusively propaganda purpose. It reflects to no less an extent the aspiration of aggressive circles of American imperialism to erase at all costs the differences between conventional and nuclear war and make nuclear blackmail a permanent factor of their foreign policy.

Having begun the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, the United States has thereby actually embarked on the creation of first-strike potential for waging a "limited nuclear war" in the European theater. It is planned to supplement this potential with the latest superpowerful and highly accurate types of nonnuclear arms designed to strike the forces and immediate rear units of the Warsaw Pact. The "limited nuclear war" doctrine is thus being given a material foundation.

I

It is not the first year that the "limited nuclear war" obsession has occupied the minds of American politicians, generals and military theorists.

Back at the end of the 1950's the then little-known Prof H. Kissinger wrote in the book "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy": "...We nonetheless cannot base all our plans on the assumption that war, should it arise, will be general only. We must look for strategic concepts which afford our diplomats the maximum freedom of action and simultaneously help determine whether the atomic age is truly fraught only with dangers and does not reveal some new opportunities."* H. Kissinger and other disciples of a policy of a strength discerned such a "new opportunity" in "limited nuclear war".

However, with the passage of time it has become increasingly clear that the prospect of man's universal mutual extermination in the event of such a conflict appreciably limits U.S. ruling circles' possibilities of bluffing with the threat of war. After all, in the appearance of an all-annihilating apocalypse war represents utter insanity and, consequently, can no longer be regarded as a permissible or at least rational means of policy.

None other than Robert S. McNamara, U.S. defense secretary in the Kennedy and then Johnson administrations, in particular, came to this conclusion. He was one of the first such high-ranking U.S. politicians to analyze seriously from the standpoints of the "flexible response" strategy (which by that time had come to replace the strategy of "massive retaliation" by means of unlimited nuclear war) the new correlation of forces and its military aspects. Having carefully weighed the various aspects of the "limited nuclear war" idea, he publicly rejected it as too risky.

The author of the so-called "counterforce" concept (war employing nuclear strikes only against military targets,) McNamara declared not long before his

* H. Kissinger, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," Moscow, 1959, p 64.

resignation as defense secretary in September 1967: "An appreciable quantitative superiority in arms, unlike in any other era in military history, cannot now be translated directly into political diktat or diplomatic advantage. Despite the fact that thermonuclear power is inconceivably tremendous and affords the practically unlimited possibility of destruction, it has proven to be of little meaning as a diplomatic instrument."* And although as Pentagon chief McNamara made considerable efforts to restore to the United States its position of military superiority which it had by that time lost, he was ultimately himself forced to acknowledge the futility of such attempts and also that there is no military-technical way of tackling the task of ensuring international security in the nuclear age.

This conclusion was shared at that time and subsequently by many other U.S. military authorities ([Dzh. Vizner] and [G.] York), top specialists in the sphere of international relations (H. Morgenthau, for instance), politicians (K. Thompson, W. Panofsky) and many others. Sober voices reasonably warned that atomic war is not a chess game which presupposes the calm and unhurried consideration of each position. Its course is not subordinate to some rules of the game stipulated in advance. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible to immediately stop it at the consent of the parties. Having once begun, it would inevitably be beyond any control and would lead to an irreversible catastrophe whose fire would consume the most eager political ambitions. "The nuclear deadlock," K. Thompson wrote in the mid-1970's. "has made a universal military clash unacceptable, and inasmuch as the big powers are deprived of the possibility of using the entire arsenal of their arms, they are left with nothing other than solving their conflicts by political means."**

This seemingly sole reasonable formulation of the question was nonetheless given a hostile reception by many people in Washington inasmuch as it shuffled the cards of the traditional "diplomatic game" which the United States had become accustomed to playing in the international arena. People here began to ponder how nonetheless to keep nuclear weapons, which are good only for collective suicide, in the arsenal of the politicians and diplomats. A persistent search for the unthinkable began: methods of rehabilitating in this form or the other power politics in the nuclear age.

As a result of these attempts the "limited nuclear war" idea again moved to the forefront. It was supported by J. Schlesinger--U.S. defense secretary in R. Nixon's administration. All subsequent administrations have paid tribute to it in one way or another. It continued to be actively developed under U.S. defense secretaries D. Rumsfeld and H. Brown and is now being developed by C. Weinberger. In addition, the "limited nuclear war" idea has gradually become increasingly dangerous. In parallel with its development the increasingly powerful and destructive military potential has been perfected from year to year, and Washington's general strategic concepts also have become increasingly aggressive.

* Quoted from A. Arbatov, "Security in the Nuclear Age and Washington's Policy," Moscow, 1980, p 43.

** K. Thompson, "Prospects and Limitations of Diplomacy" (THE REVIEW OF POLITICS No 2, 1974).

The very debate surrounding the use of nuclear weapons is engendering the extremely dangerous illusion that the scale and outcome of a nuclear confrontation may be controlled either with the aid of this military doctrine or the other or by way of the use of some particular type of arms. In fact, however, everything is precisely the other way about. Any aggressive doctrine necessarily requires a further refinement of arms. And this, in turn, leads to the modification of the military doctrine and its increasing adventurism. The one inevitably prompts the other here.

Each of Washington's military precepts--the "massive retribution," "flexible response," "realistic deterrence" and, finally, "direct confrontation" strategies--is distinguished one from another basically by the consistent toughening of their anti-Soviet thrust and increasingly candid hegemonist pretensions in respect of other countries and peoples. At the same time, in parallel with the escalation of aggressiveness at all levels of the U.S. armed forces, various-purpose weapons and various delivery systems for them are being created feverishly.

The more diverse the arsenal of the armed forces, the American Pentagon hawks claim, the greater the opportunities for the choice of both the weapons and nature of a nuclear war. They are persistently attempting here to pursue the sinister thought that nuclear weapons are in no way appreciably different from conventional weapons and that their use is perfectly permissible in both a global and "limited war".

The book "Strategy for Tomorrow"* by H. Baldwin, military commentator of the NEW YORK TIMES known for his closeness to the Pentagon, in which the author acted on behalf of the ultraright circles of America which altogether do not allow of the possibility of war ever being excluded from the life of society, came out in the United States back in 1970 (that is, at precisely the time when the detente process was gathering strength in Soviet-American relations). The premise that nuclear war is legitimate and that one side could come out of it with "relative military superiority" distinctly permeates all the author's arguments. For this reason, Baldwin writes, the United States should concern itself with securing the capacity for delivering a preventive nuclear strike. Any defensive strategy, he concludes, should begin with clear and definite nuclear superiority over the enemy. The summary conclusion is unequivocal--it is essential to build up the United States' nuclear potential as rapidly and on as great a scale as possible.

The positive changes in the international arena in the first half of the 1970's and the relaxation of tension should seemingly at least have shaken such notions of the American hawks. By no means! A new H. Baldwin book "The Price of Power," appeared in 1976. In it the author essentially repeats his previous premises. "We must recognize," he categorically states, "that the next war is perfectly possible anytime, anywhere and of any nature.... For this reason the nation's military power is essential, as before, and could be even more essential than ever."**

* See. H. Baldwin, "Strategy for Tomorrow," New York, 1970.

** H. Baldwin, "The Price of Power," New York, 1976, p 19.

Baldwin goes even further in his conclusions now. He suggests that the U.S. ruling circles be guided by the tactics not of defense but of offense. Given the possession of weapons of mass annihilation, he claims, the concept of "active operations" (that is essentially a first strike) becomes the main one, and this should fundamentally change America's strategic concepts inasmuch as the "best defense" against atomic bombs and intercontinental missiles is a powerful attack and the creation of "the threat of more powerful strikes against enemy territory," which naturally presupposes the "active preparation and maintenance of a fully equipped mobile force ready for an immediate offensive operation."*

Returning to the book's title, H. Baldwin formulates the conclusion: the price of power is huge; it means strenuous labor and not rest, struggle and not peace, taxes and not wealth. The motto of our century should be: "Spend sufficient on defense, and you will be saved."**

All these entreaties were uttered, we would note, only a year after the All-European Conference in Helsinki, when the detente process had achieved its greatest upsurge. They are essentially in no way different from the pronouncements of the not-unknown B. Goldwater, who in the book "Why not Victory?" (1962) proclaimed without a shadow of doubt: there is nothing to fear in a nuclear war, we should not dread casualties and ruins, the main thing is winning "a total victory over communism."***

The political irresponsibility of Goldwater's speeches is known well enough, but this senator's pathological anti-Sovietism has repeatedly been at odds with elementary commonsense. But, after all, such aggressive standpoints are also shared by certain venerable American scientists. And such opinions and conclusions are even more serious and dangerous if they are shared by politicians with the power to make decisions.

The physicist E. Teller, the "father of the hydrogen bomb," at one time, when B. Goldwater was calling for "total victory over communism" by means of nuclear war, spoke in unison with him. Speculating on his reputation as an erudite person in these matters, he asserted (in a statement at the start of the 1960's) that even if America's industrial enterprises "are totally destroyed," the people who survive, "properly provided with food and means of production," could, "working selflessly," restore the industrial potential to its prewar dimensions, and in not more than 5 years, furthermore.

While estimating with such accuracy how much time it would take to eliminate the consequences of a nuclear war, the American scientist does not, it is true, explain how it will be possible to provide the people who survive with means of production and food if the industrial potential, as he himself acknowledges, "is totally destroyed". However, this fact did not embarrass him in the least, evidently.

* H. Baldwin, "The Price of Power," New York, 1976, pp 17-18.

** Ibid., p 322.

*** See B. Goldwater, "Why not Victory? A Fresh Look at American Foreign Policy," New York, 1962, pp 149-163.

II

The statements quoted above were made mainly at the dawn of the nuclear era, when the depth of the danger had not been revealed as obviously as now. But the years have elapsed, and the nuclear arsenals of the opposed military groupings have been reinforced with increasingly powerful weapons of mass annihilation. It is common knowledge that the United States and the USSR now have the possibility of exterminating each other many times over and that if matters come to a nuclear confrontation, the whole world will be threatened.

It is, of course, possible to indulge in whatever irresponsible calculations one pleases of how many millions of people will die and how many will remain after a nuclear catastrophe and adduce this consideration or the other in support of one's highly dubious conclusions, which is being done by certain U.S. circles. But this will always only be an attempt to close one's eyes to the new reality born of contemporary scientific-technical progress, which aggressive groupings of imperialism, contrary to the vital interests of the peoples and commonsense itself, are endeavoring to put at the service of their policy.

In reality the question now is entirely different: can mankind survive a nuclear war at all and, if so, will it be able to exist on an earth poisoned by radiation? Specialists of various fields either find it difficult to answer this question, referring to the fact that the current level of knowledge does not make it possible to envisage all the consequences of the impact of nuclear war on the environment, the biosphere and man himself and his descendants, or answer in the negative. The majority of them agrees on one thing: what possibly might directly survive a nuclear war could no longer be called either civilization or the human race in our present-day notion of these concepts.

However, the American hawks have their own "logic" on this score. Thus T. Jones, assistant deputy U.S. defense secretary for strategic nuclear forces, adheres to the viewpoint that, given a proper civil defense system, it would take the United States only 2-4 years to completely eliminate the consequences of even a general nuclear war with the Soviet Union.*

The leadership of the Federal Emergency Management Agency which has been created in the United States fully shares this "optimism". Thus a certain W. (Chipmen), who is in charge of the civil defense department in this agency, declares with unusual self-assurance in the specially issued brochure "Wiping Out the Consequences of a Nuclear Strike" that this is not that complicated a matter. He, for example, categorically rejects medical men's opinion concerning the inevitability of such consequences of nuclear strikes (besides their direct casualties) as the spread of epidemics and all kinds of infectious diseases.

* See LOS ANGELES TIMES, 24 January 1982.

For "proof" of this position he appeals, incidentally, by no means to the data of modern science but makes a historical digression to the mid-14th century, when the bubonic plague epidemic, which flared up on the site of war, devastated Europe. For (Chipmen) this event represents an inspiring argument in favor of nuclear war. "For all that, 6 or 8 years after this English society had not only recovered but with God's help expeditionary troops had been formed even and a campaign against France undertaken."* The main thing, in the opinion of the brochure's author, had thereby been achieved: a sufficient number of people had survived to be able to unleash a new war.

Bravado in connection with the possibility of a nuclear confrontation has become customary in present-day America. And how could it be otherwise if Washington officials are essentially encouraging it in every way and setting the tone with the statements that "war is not the most dreadful thing," "peace is not the most important thing," that "there are things more important than peace" and so forth.

True, recently Washington's propaganda on foreign policy issues has been undergoing something of a metamorphosis: the affectedly belligerent speeches of White House representatives are giving way to just as affectedly peace-loving phraseology. President Reagan declares that today he would not call the Soviet Union the "focus of evil". He "regrets" that the Soviet-American arms reduction negotiations are "temporarily suspended" and calls on the USSR to return to Geneva. On 16 January of this year, on the eve of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building, Security and Disarmament Measures in Europe, the head of the White House delivered a big speech in which he spoke at length of "devotion to a limitation of the arms race." Of course, the Republican administration's concern is understandable. The political situation in the United States and abroad is compelling it (albeit in words) to alter the tone of its public statements with an adjustment for the exigencies of the moment.

In the international arena the United States' expansionist policy is encountering increasingly emphatic opposition. At the last, 38th, UN General Assembly session the United States found itself manifestly isolated on a number of most acute present-day problems, primarily those directly connected with preventing nuclear war. The start of the deployment of the American Pershings and cruise missiles on the European continent stimulated the antiwar movement even more. Whence Washington's endeavor to evade responsibility for the breakdown of the disarmament negotiations and to attempt again and again to shift the blame for this race onto someone else.

But what is the worth of Reagan's pseudo-peace-loving tirades and his assurances of his aspiration to an understanding with the Soviet Union if they are not confirmed by any constructive proposals? More, if in the same speech the U.S. President again emphasized the intention of America's ruling circles to continue to build up military power and, what is most important,

* LOS ANGELES TIMES, 24 January 1982.

if simultaneously with pharisaical assurances about the United States' love of peace the military-industrial complex is multiplying and perfecting the arsenal of aggression incessantly and at a growing pace? "In short," as A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR foreign minister, observed in a speech at the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe on 18 January 1984, "the present U.S. Administration is one which thinks in terms of war and acts accordingly."

It is important to stress that while advancing the "limited nuclear war" concept the Pentagon at the same time, first, has never ceased to prepare for a global war and, second, has invariably recognized and continued to recognize the priority of the refinement of first-strike weapons. Whence it is clear that a "limited nuclear war" is conceived of by American strategists as a kind of intermediate stage. As far as a broad-scale nuclear confrontation with the use of all weapons of extermination is concerned, it is by no means precluded but remains up to a certain time in reserve, as it were, as a means of pressure on the enemy.

At the start of the 1980's the United States embarked in practice on preparing the potential for waging such a war. At the last moment of his term in the White House J. Carter issued PD 59 (1980). It stipulated a number of new points. In particular, a more rigid orientation toward a disarming first strike was outlined. To deliver it it was proposed using not only strategic but also so-called "Eurostrategic" missiles, that is, American medium-range missiles deployed in West Europe.

In accordance with this document, the overall "limited nuclear war" scenario envisaged a sudden strike by strategic offensive forces, whose main purpose is destruction of the nuclear, primarily strategic, power of a "potential enemy" to deliver a retaliatory strike or, at least, to reduce the force thereof as much as possible.

In order to realize the set goals it is necessary, naturally, to have the corresponding potential capable of hitting targets with great accuracy. The arsenal of nuclear forces built for waging a global war is unsuitable for this. Such first-strike weapons began to be developed in the United States in the first half of the 1970's even in parallel with the theoretical study of the "limited nuclear war" concept. In the latter half of the 1970's these efforts continued at an ever increasing pace. The R. Reagan administration has imparted to them a truly unprecedented scale. Particular attention is being paid to such systems as that same MX intercontinental strategic missile, the Trident 2, the new MK-12a warhead, whose yield and accuracy of hit are double those of the previous MK-12 warhead, and cruise missiles. All these systems and also the Pershings deployed in West Europe are first-strike weapons.

The stockpiling of such "counterforce," as it is called in the United States, potential is presented by American military specialists as a method that has at last been found of extrication from the "deadlock" of nuclear parity and as an opportunity which has been acquired for the "realization" of nuclear war as a means of solving political problems. This is what R. Osgood, an

acknowledged transatlantic expert on U.S. current military strategy, writes in this connection in the book "Limited War Revisited": "The development of strategic arms of increased accuracy, their more flexible targeting and more reliable command--control--communications systems have secured new technical possibilities for making an exchange of strategic nuclear strikes a rational instrument of policy instead of an act of national suicide."*

And, indeed, could a "limited nuclear" war be more "rational" and humane than a general nuclear war: after all, it is not cities which are destroyed, only military targets, and the number of casualties would seemingly be reduced. But this could appear to be the case only at first sight and could deceive only those who themselves wish to be deceived.

First of all, what is meant by the damage from a "counterforce" war being "slight"? The majority of specialists agrees that if a nuclear duel were fought with jeweler's precision and affected only military targets, even in this case millions of people would die, considerable sectors of social life would be disorganized and the consequences of radiation would be catastrophic.

The main thing, however, is what follows: there are no guarantees that a nuclear war could be kept within a certain framework. On the contrary, there is every reason to assert that nuclear weapons, "unlimited" in their destructive essence, preclude a "limited" war. Unlimited in their power, delivery systems and the entirely unpredictable consequences to which their use could lead, nuclear weapons are assuming their own logic, which is incompatible with concepts of moderation and rationality. In this sense they represent a kind of culmination of the long evolution of armed forces and war itself as a social phenomenon, evolution from its relative rationality and relative controllability to insanity and complete uncontrollability.

In the nuclear age, when war embraces land, sea, air and space, when a nuclear strike can be delivered from any point on land and in the oceans and the stratosphere and at any target, wherever it may be, and when the entire world may be turned into the theater of military operations and people are being replaced at the panel controlling the military operations by electronic machinery, control over the weapons of annihilation is altogether slipping from man's hands.

Faced with these facts, one has to presume the unbelievable to believe in the possibility of "limited nuclear war". To persuade oneself that the means of devastation, which it was not before possible to keep in the arsenals, may in some unknown way be limited to theaters of military operations, when the world is already turning into chaos. To admit of the utterly illusory hope that politicians, who have not been able to agree among themselves to avoid war, may suddenly be capable of displaying commonsense and preventing it growing into a global level. Can it really, for example, be guaranteed that in the event of American imperialism losing a "counterforce," "limited" war it would not resort to even more powerful types of weapons?

* R. Osgood, "Limited War Revisited," Boulder, 1979, p 57.

And here is something else which is important to bear in mind: the very idea of a "small," "limited" nuclear war in any form, in a Blitzkrieg or protracted form, essentially leads to nothing other than the erasure of the boundary between conventional and nuclear war inasmuch as the so-called "nuclear threshold" is objectively lowered. The danger of a universal catastrophe thereby becomes more real.

The modern version of the "counterforce" strategy also leads to a lowering of the "nuclear threshold". For the very illusion that nuclear weapons may be employed effectively, without great losses, against an enemy's military targets and, in addition, reduce the possibility of a retaliatory concentrated strike is capable only of encouraging an aggressor.

It is impossible to keep nuclear war within a certain framework stipulated in advance. "Is it possible to seriously discuss," Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, observed in this connection, "some limited nuclear war? After all, it is clear to all that an aggressor's actions would inevitably and immediately bring about the annihilating retaliatory strike of the side subjected to the aggression. Only completely irresponsible people can claim that a nuclear war may be waged according to some rules drawn up in advance, in accordance with which nuclear missiles are to explode in "gentlemanly fashion": only over certain targets, not hitting the population here."*

Attempting to camouflage the aggressive essence of the proposition concerning the permissibility of nuclear war, American ruling circles interpret it in the spirit of the "restraint" concept. President Reagan and his closest advisers are developing this version virtually daily. In fact, however, the idea of "small," "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war perfectly obviously goes beyond the framework of restraint. Its aggressive essence is exposed primarily once again by the fact that it is a by no means retaliatory but precisely a first-strike strategy. The American scientist R. Aldridge observed perfectly reasonably in this connection in an article with the characteristic title "Decisive First Strike Concept": "The strategy of the choice primarily of military targets is called 'counterforce' strategy and is utterly unrelated to the principle of restraint. Its purpose is not to ensure nuclear deadlock or a 'balance of fear' but to prepare for the United States' delivery of a sudden strike. The superpower which is oriented to the strategic principle of 'counterforce' must strike first for otherwise its bombs will fall on empty missile silos. The attempts to conceal this strategy's orientation toward the delivery of a first strike are the greatest deception to which the American people have ever been subjected."

That the United States' new nuclear strategy is a first-strike strategy is not doubted by a single serious military specialist. At the same time none of them can have any doubt that militarily a first strike, even with superaccurate and supermodern "counterforce" potential, is the most complete

* PRAVDA, 25 July 1981.

absurdity. After all, it would be at least ridiculous to suppose that the side opposed to the United States would consent to some "rules of the game" beneficial only to the aggressor. And that a first strike would not be followed by a powerful counterstrike.

III

The very idea of nuclear war is giving rise to justified criticism on the part of many competent persons in the West, including the United States itself. After all, it would be simply improbable to assume that the "limited nuclear war" supporters in Washington do not take account of the simple truth that a hypothetical exchange of nuclear strikes (even if it is assumed for a moment that it would occur in the "limited" version of "counterforce" strategy) could have irreversible consequences for the United States itself. And it can hardly be doubted that it is this consideration which constitutes the main reason for the persistent efforts being made by the Reagan administration to make the arena of a potential nuclear war not the United States but the territory of other countries situated far from the United States. It would like to conduct matters such as to move the epicenter of nuclear war far away from the territory of the United States itself and transfer it to, say, Europe, the Indian Ocean region, the Far East or some other part of the world.

American strategists assign Europe the obvious priority in these plans. And it is understandable why. On the European continent the two most powerful military-political groupings of the present-day--the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact states--confront each other most directly in the sense that the demarcation line between them runs along national borders. Whence, as, evidently, the Pentagon believes, it is easiest to strike the most telling blow at the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries.

Guided by these motives, Washington is persistently endeavoring to move toward the borders of the Soviet Union and the European socialist countries the new medium-range weapons systems, which are intended for strategic assignments. The deployment of the American Pershing 2's and Tomahawks in the FRG and a number of other West European countries is aimed at a fundamental change in the strategic situation on the European continent to the detriment of the Warsaw Pact states.

Attempts are being made in NATO circles to pass this decision off as "rearmament" and "modernization" of the North Atlantic bloc's nuclear arsenal in the "European theater" allegedly in the face of the Warsaw Pact's military superiority. This is a deliberate lie. By the start of the 1980's an approximate balance had evolved between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries in Europe in the number of medium-range missiles--approximately 1,000 per side. Therefore the deployment of the new "Eurostrategic" missiles is aimed at a quantitative change in the balance of forces in Europe in favor of NATO.

The deployment of American ground-based nuclear missiles of great accuracy on the borders of the USSR and the European socialist countries means a qualitative change in the strategic situation in Europe. After all, resolving to launch intercontinental strategic missiles from U.S. territory which can

reach the target in 25-30 minutes, when the opposite side obviously has time to undertake a retaliatory launch of its own missiles and inflict on the aggressor "unacceptable damage," is one thing. Launching nuclear missiles from the territory of West Europe, when the flight time is put at 4-6 minutes, which, according to the calculations of American strategists, deprives a potential enemy of the opportunity of delivering a retaliatory strike, is another. Thus the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe is objectively aimed at the creation in this region of first, "preemptive" strike potential in this region which, in accordance with Pentagon intentions, could either force the USSR to accept American terms of capitulation or be the first act in a global nuclear war in which the initiative of the first strike and the advantages connected with it would from the outset be on the side of the United States.

The deployment on the European continent of the new American nuclear missiles is being presented in the form of a "new concept of the defense of West Europe." It is a question of the creation of a so-called component of NATO Joint Armed Forces in Europe--the "Eurostrategic nuclear forces". Together with the American "theater" nuclear forces (that is, U.S. forward-based nuclear forces deployed in the vicinity of the Warsaw Pact States) and its conventional armed forces stationed in Europe they are to constitute a modernized NATO "triad" which could respond to the tasks of waging a war confined to the European continent.

Inasmuch as the Soviet medium-range missiles do not reach U.S. territory, while the American missiles of this class deployed in West Europe are capable of striking vital centers in the Soviet Union (that is, are strategic weapons), the Pentagon is hoping to achieve its global aims at the expense of the European allies. In accordance with the version of a "limited war" "enclosed" within the geographical framework of Europe, military operations are to take place without the involvement of the United States' strategic nuclear forces, that is, so that the nuclear conflagration not affect the American continent.

In American special literature this is called "redistributing the degree of risk" within NATO and in mass propaganda is presented as "concern for the security" of West Europe. Motivated by these allegedly purely "altruistic" intentions, the United States is demonstrating truly boundless "generosity". It is stinting on nothing for its allies and is ready, not reckoning with the will of the peoples in the slightest, to impose increasingly new types of weapons on them.

In the name of West Europe's "security" Washington sought from Bonn, London and Rome consent to the deployment of the new American medium-range missiles. In the name of West Europe's "security" Washington intends to supply the NATO armed forces with neutron weapons. In the name of "security" Washington is contemplating making Europe once again a gas chamber. At the same time negotiations are under way on modernizing nonnuclear arms for the purpose of enhancing their yield and strike accuracy.

At the end of December 1982 these intentions acquired perfectly specific outlines in the form of the so-called "doctrine" of the American general B. Rogers, supreme commander NATO Joint Armed Forces in Europe. The "Rogers doctrine" proceeds from the possibility of fighting a long nonnuclear war using conventional weapons, but on condition of their appreciable reorganization. He by no means refers to the preparation of a nonnuclear war instead of a nuclear war here but regards it as a kind of supplement to the latter. General Rogers is demanding increased preparations for a "protracted war" with the use of "ultramodern electronic intelligence weapons" and new missiles with conventional, nonnuclear warheads, but with exceptionally high tactical-technical specifications capable of hitting the enemy forces "throughout the depth of their dispositions."

Need it be said that in this formulation of the question of "Rogers doctrine" may be regarded as no more than a further escalation of the arms race oriented toward a "limited" war in Europe which would give American imperialism the same result as a "victorious" general nuclear war. President Reagan's statement made back in October 1981 testifies that this version is viewed in Washington as perfectly possible and undoubtedly preferable (inasmuch as the United States could then seemingly avoid a strike altogether). "A situation could develop," he claimed, "of both sides exchanging strikes by tactical weapons against troop contingents on the battlefield without any of the big powers pressing the button"* (that is, the strategic missile firing button--V.K.). The "battlefield" in this case is the European continent. It has reached the point where the Pentagon is beginning to talk about how to give different ranking representatives of the American command greater freedom in respect of the use of all types of weapons (including nuclear and chemical) and in determining the targets of nuclear or chemical attack in the event of war.

But at this moment American geopoliticians' particular attention is attracted not only by Europe. This conclusion is confirmed by the Pentagon's "Airland Battle" doctrine. Its main innovation is that it presupposes an appreciable qualitative modernization of nonnuclear weapons and the first use of all possible means of arms (conventional, chemical, nuclear) not only in the European theater but everywhere in the world and in all parts of the world where NATO has "vitally important interests". Thus developing the doctrine of "limited nuclear war" and also of a war using nonnuclear weapons, American strategists are linking this with a stimulation of its military presence on the "periphery" also, that is, in the zone of the national liberation movement.

The wish is to instill in the American people that only armed with a "big stick" is the United States capable of preserving for itself the role of great power, and the future "battlefield" for America is the whole world. Even today the task is to secure for itself in the world as many strategically important points as possible and to build up its armed forces here. Believing that it is the developing countries which could cause American imperialism

* Quoted from "Whence the Threat to Peace," Moscow, 1982, p 14.

the biggest "trouble" in the future, U.S. ruling circles are of the opinion that military intervention in potential crisis situations over vast expanses of the developing world will be a basic direction of "power politics" in the 1980's.

The United States has had considerable practice here, as is known. U.S. Army subunits took part in military operations in Korea and Vietnam, Laos, Lebanon and the Dominican Republic and carried out an armed blockade of Cuba.... Nonetheless, up to a certain time Washington officials endeavored, albeit outwardly, to somehow distance themselves from direct acts of aggression and intervention. Even during the Vietnam war they adhered to the so-called "Nixon doctrine," which proceeds from the premise that, relying on reactionary regimes and arming them against their own peoples, it is possible to force "Asians to fight Asians" and "Africans to fight Africans" and for oneself to remain aloof, as it were.

However, the "Nixon doctrine" very quickly revealed its complete groundlessness. And subsequently, no longer relying on satellites, the United States has counted mainly on its own forces to "instill order". This does not mean, of course, that Washington is hereby abandoning, if only to some extent, its traditional backstage game in the so-called Third World. By no means. And it may be said with all certainty that if the United States had occupied a different position both globally and in respect of this specific situation or the other of our day, there would not have been the tragedy of Lebanon, the battle on the Falklands (Malvinas), the bloody days of El Salvador or the armed provocations in Southern Africa. It is not difficult to see behind the facade of all these dramatic events the imperial ambitions of the United States and an endeavor to take advantage of any destabilization of the situation in the world for accomplishing its own expansionist tasks.

But there is also no doubt that the main direction of American policy in respect of countries of the developing world now is one of direct military pressure. Direct aggression. A graphic example of which was Grenada. Mankind saw with its own eyes in the predatory U.S. act against this small country that where Reagan's America has a preponderance of strength, it will act as on Grenada--it will unceremoniously trample and stifle its victim, guided here by a single motive--its own hegemonist pretensions and nothing more.

Grenada was by no means an isolated phenomenon. And only a blind man could fail to spot the obvious interconnection of such events as the aggression against Grenada, the occupation of Lebanon, the CIA's undeclared war against Nicaragua, the deployment of American missiles in West Europe and so forth. On all meridians one and the same importunate trend--reliance on force and military superiority and the solution of all international problems by the armed path.

Where Washington has a chance to activate the guns, it does so unhesitatingly. Where, on the other hand, it cannot pursue "gunboat diplomacy," U.S. imperialism sets as its goal the achievement of military superiority in order to pursue from this position a policy of nuclear blackmail in the form of the threat of a "limited" or global war for the world according to Reagan is either America's patrimony or a graveyard beneath the ruins of a nuclear Armageddon.

Any versions of a "limited" nuclear or conventional, "Blitzkrieg" or "protracted" war come down to two basic postulates: first, making war in the nuclear age possible, second, bringing it as close to the borders of the Soviet Union as possible.

Both these premises ignore, however, the main thing, namely, that in our time any "local" conflict inevitably affects many "nerve centers" of world politics and entails the threat of growth into a universal catastrophe.

Whatever scenarios of a "limited nuclear war" are being concocted in the Pentagon, whatever versions are elaborated, none of them will be anything other than a variety of global catastrophe. At the current level of development of the production forces, science and technology there is one sole practicable solution of the problem of international security: no war.

Addressing the voters of Moscow's Kuybyshev Electoral Okrug on 2 March 1984, K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, called on leaders of the powers possessing nuclear weapons to subordinate relations between these powers to certain rules common for all and formulated their basic content. Among the points of fundamental importance the proposition: "Renounce propaganda of nuclear war in any version thereof--global or limited"*--was highlighted. This proposition is again confirmed by the constancy of the position of the CPSU and the Soviet state: nuclear war cannot be allowed--neither small, big, limited nor total.

This is the command of our time.

The nuclear age has made very considerable adjustments to the concept of national and international security. The traditional approaches of the past are no longer any good. Whereas previously it was believed that military superiority was a reliable guarantee of national security, it is now becoming increasingly obvious that even the most colossal arms potential is incapable in itself of guaranteeing it. Whereas previously national security could with certain justification have been viewed in a regional plane, it is now acquiring a world scale. In our time, in the face of the threat of nuclear war, relations between all states must be weighed to the utmost and their interests reciprocally considered, primarily from the standpoints of national security and the security of all mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

* PRAVDA, 3 March 1984.

U.S. 'GUNBOAT DIPLOMACY' IN LEBANON, SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 51-63

[Article by O. Kovtunovich, V. Nosenko: "The Near East--Imperialism's Power Politics in Action"]

[Text] The tension that has existed in the Near East for several decades not only is not abating but is assuming an increasingly dramatic and explosive nature. The tragedy of the Palestinian Arab people continues. Israel has engaged in unconcealed genocide against the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. On the Arab land captured in 1967 it is pursuing a policy of strict terror against the indigenous population and intensively building its militarized settlements here, preparing for the direct annexation of this territory.

The framework of the Arab-Israeli conflict has expanded considerably: a sovereign Arab state--Lebanon--has become a new victim of aggression. Throughout the 1970's this country was repeatedly subjected to armed attacks on the part of Israel, and in the summer of 1982 the Tel Aviv military, having perpetrated large-scale aggression against Lebanon, captured a considerable proportion of its territory. In the wake of the Israeli occupiers Lebanese soil was invaded by military subunits of the United States and a number of its NATO allies under the fraudulent sign of "multinational force" committed allegedly to ensure Lebanon's "security". In practice the true purpose of this interventionist force was by no means to ensure Lebanon's security but to kindle intercommunal strife in the country in order to weaken the Lebanese national-patriotic forces and the Palestinian movement, which are putting up courageous resistance to the imperialist intervention. Although the interventionists have been forced to pull out of Beirut, an armada of U.S. ships in full combat readiness remains off Lebanon's shores, demonstrating Washington's adherence to "battleship diplomacy".

Thus the United States is not confining itself to the role of Israel's backstage partner in aggression, it has committed its own armed forces to the Near East in an attempt to realize its own imperial designs here. Instead of a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, American policy is leading to a further exacerbation of the situation in the region and the continuation of the constant threat to the security of the peoples of this region and universal peace.

Washington's Near East strategy is inseparably linked with the global adventurist militarist policy of the White House. "...Recent years," K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized, "have been marked by a sharp stimulation of the policy of the most aggressive circles of American imperialism--a policy of avowed militarism, claims to world domination, resistance to progress and violation of the rights and liberties of the peoples. The world has seen many examples of its practical application." In the Near East, which the United States has arbitrarily declared a zone of its "vitally important interests," it is attempting to break the resistance of the anti-imperialist forces and establish its hegemony there. The main local strong point of this imperial policy is Israel, the expansionist appetites of whose ruling upper stratum Washington is actively taking advantage of for striking at the national liberation movement in the region.

The artificially created "power" of Israel no longer appears to its transatlantic patrons sufficient for the realization of their designs and is being underpinned by the expansion of the direct U.S. military presence in this part of the world. American naval formations have acquired a permanent "residence permit" in the East Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf zone. Washington is persistently seeking the creation in a number of Arab countries of its military bases and also weapons dumps which in the event of crisis situations will be used by the "rapid deployment force" as strong points for conducting large-scale military operations. American military subunits have already conducted joint maneuvers with the armies of Egypt and Sudan. In January 1983 Washington created the special Central Command (Centcom), to which the American "rapid deployment force" intended for the Near East was assigned. The creation of this body represented a step in the direction of the United States' direct military intervention over a vast expanse embracing the territory of 19 states of the region.

Extensive opportunities in this respect are also afforded the United States by the agreement on political, strategic and economic cooperation which was made official during Israeli Prime Minister Y. Shamir's visit to Washington at the end of November 1983. This document is absolutely openly aimed at assigning Israel the role of local "power center" coordinating its actions with the United States, primarily in the military sphere.

A new step of the United States in the buildup of military potential in the Near East was the deployment as part of the "multinational force" of American troops on the Sinai peninsula and in Lebanon. Furthermore, Washington is working out a system of including its NATO allies in the realization of its own aggressive plans. The mere fact of the formation of such a force represents an attempt to create an "international" mechanism controlled by the United States with which it could operate in its own interests both in the Near East and in other parts of the world, in circumvention of the corresponding UN mechanism.

The recent events in Lebanon have also laid bare other extremely dangerous trends in present American policy. It has become perfectly obvious that the R. Reagan administration regards participation in the "multinational force" as a pretext for a military presence in the region which is highly desirable for itself. Thus the American contingent in Beirut numbered 1,800 men, but in the roads in the vicinity of the Lebanese capital allegedly for ensuring the security of this contingent there is permanently a considerable number of ships of forces of the U.S. 6th Fleet, including aircraft carriers, on board which are several thousand marines who are ready to be put ashore at any moment. Having joined directly in suppression of the progressive, anti-imperialist forces in the Near East by the armed path, the R. Reagan administration is attempting to conceal its actions with the thoroughly fraudulent slogan of the "Soviet threat" in the region.

With regard for the fact that Washington is at the present time openly elevating the use of armed actions against sovereign states to the level of official policy, there is apprehension concerning the possibility of aggression by the United States in alliance with Israel against Syria, which is at the forward edge of the anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist struggle in the Near East. The adventurist policy of the United States is essentially bringing matters to the point of the Arab-Israeli conflict not only developing into a new acute crisis phase but also going beyond the framework of the region and thereby creating a threat to universal peace.

II

The change in the United States' Near East policy "legalizing" the use of force has not occurred in a void and, strictly speaking, is not distinguished by particular novelty. It is rather a question of a shift of accents to power methods, which have by no means been alien to American policy previously. This change began to manifest itself particularly distinctly after H. Kissinger's "shuttle diplomacy," which was aimed at achieving separate agreements between Israel and the Arab countries, had begun to skid in the mid-1970's and at the end of this decade the attempts to include other--besides Egypt--participants in the Near East conflict in implementation of the capitulationist Camp David deal and compel them to follow the example of the as-Sadat regime had failed.

The serious obstacles in the way of a Near East settlement which arose through the fault of American diplomacy undermined Washington's prestige in the Arab world, among the conservative regimes included. The United States' influence in the region was also considerably weakened at that time in connection with the revolution in Iran, which was of an anti-imperialist nature. Endeavoring to compensate for the manifest failures in its policy in the Near East, the J. Carter administration resolved to resort to a show of strength in the hope of restoring the shaken American positions there.

At the start of 1979 Z. Brzezinski, the U.S. President's national security adviser, advanced a concept whose essence was that a number of countries of the Horn of Africa and the Near and Middle East are allegedly distinguished by a high degree of internal instability. On the pretext of warding off the mythical "Soviet threat" the concept substantiated the need for an American military presence in this vast region, which had acquired the name "arc of

crisis". Particular significance in the region was attached to the Persian Gulf zone with its huge oil reserves. It was here that large subunits of U.S. warships with marines on board were sent. In 1979 Washington began to form at an accelerated pace the "rapid deployment force," which underwent special training for conducting military operations under Near and Middle East conditions. It was planned in 1980 even to increase the strength of these formations to 200,000 men.

In his annual report to Congress in January 1980 J. Carter advanced the notorious doctrine which declared the Persian Gulf a zone of the United States' "vitally important interests". Essentially Washington arbitrarily arrogated to itself the right to interfere in the internal affairs of a number of sovereign states many thousands of kilometers from the United States. The central place in the "Carter doctrine" was occupied by plans to transfer American military units to the Persian Gulf, create military bases in this zone and also build up the United States' naval presence in the Indian Ocean. However, the Arabs adopted an extremely negative attitude toward the idea of the creation of foreign bases on their territory, rightly evaluating it as a relapse into imperial policy. The biggest country of the Arabian peninsula--Saudi Arabia--and, following it, the majority of Arab Gulf states also, despite their traditionally close relations with the United States, refused to consent to an infringement of their sovereignty. Nonetheless, the White House did succeed in creating on the territory of some countries weapons dumps and equipment for the "rapid deployment force". Thus the foundation for the deployment of U.S. interventionist forces in the Near East was laid back at the time of the previous U.S. Administration.

Elected to the presidency in 1980, R. Reagan shifted the center of gravity in Washington's global strategy to the military-force aspects and openly adopted a policy aimed at frustrating the process of the relaxation of international tension. An important place in this strategy was assigned the Near East region. The White House was candid enough in declaring its intention of, first, enhancing Israel's role in American regional policy and, second, sharply toughening the U.S. position in respect of local progressive forces, primarily the PLO. A document adopted by the Republican Party Convention on 15 July 1980 in Detroit and which reflected R. Reagan's election platform further declared: "The sovereignty, security and integrity of the state of Israel are a moral imperative and serve the strategic interests of the United States. Republicans confirm their fundamental and permanent allegiance to this principle. We will continue to make good our national commitments by means of political, economic, diplomatic and military assistance. We fully recognize Israel's strategic significance...."* As far as the problems of a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict are concerned, this document proclaimed as the main goal of American policy the achievement of a "just and lasting peace." The events of subsequent years, which have brought the peoples of the Near East so many casualties and such devastation, have demonstrated to the whole world the true value of this hypocritical rhetoric.

The situation in the Near East by the time of the change of guard in the White House remained extremely tense as a result of American diplomacy's attempts to achieve a "settlement" on the basis of the Camp David plan.

* FOCUS, 1 August 1980, p 3.

By 26 May 1980, that is, by the officially scheduled date of the completion of the negotiations on so-called "Palestinian autonomy," the parties to the separate deal--the United States, Israel and Egypt--had been unable to achieve any results. Under conditions where the "Camp David process" had made increasingly remote the prospect of the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Near East, the aggressiveness of Israel's policy was growing constantly. A striking demonstration of this was the Begin government's proclamation in August 1980 of a "united" Jerusalem as the "eternal capital" of Israel.

However, it was not only and not so much the situation that had taken shape in the Near East which prompted the new White House administration to attempt to circumvent the process of an all-embracing settlement. The main thing for Washington were considerations of a global nature, namely: the intention to incorporate the states of this region in the strict confrontation with the Soviet Union which was being developed by the United States.

In the course of a visit to a number of Near East countries in April 1981 then U.S. Secretary of State A. Haig persistently attempted to instill in the leaders of conservative Arab regimes that the main danger for the region was represented by the alleged "Soviet threat" and that therefore they should push their conflict with Israel into the background in order to join together with it in a bloc of anti-Soviet and anticommunist forces--the so-called "strategic consensus"--being knocked together by Washington. Whereas Israel and as-Sadat's Egypt supported this idea, the other Arab countries rejected it, giving as the reason for their position the fact that the real danger for the Arab world was represented by the policy of the Tel Aviv, and some "accord" with it without a just settlement of the Near East conflict was impossible. They emphasized particularly here the need for consideration of the Palestinian factor.

At that time, availing itself of the strengthening pro-Israel sentiments in Washington which were discerned distinctly after R. Reagan had taken over the White House, the Begin government engaged throughout 1981 in a new series of aggressive actions. In the spring of that same year Israeli aircraft made a number of provocative attacks against Syrian troops in Lebanon, who are there at the decision of the Arab League as part of the "inter-Arab force". In June 1981 the Tel Aviv military carried out a bandit sally against Iraq, destroying in the course of the air raid the atomic reactor near Baghdad, at which, according to an IAEA commission, there were no signs of the production of raw material for military purposes. A month later densely populated areas of Beirut were subjected to barbaric bombing, and then for more than 2 weeks the Israeli Army conducted large-scale military operations in South Lebanon against PLO detachments and Lebanese national-patriotic forces. It is indicative that both during the raid on the Baghdad reactor and during the Beirut bombing Israel employed F-15 and F-16 aircraft which it had received from across the ocean.

Although it failed to achieve a "strategic consensus," the R. Reagan administration did not abandon plans for the militarization of Near East countries and their involvement in kinds of informal blocs. In the fall of 1981 the American "rapid deployment force" conducted the Bright Star maneuvers together with the armies of Egypt, Sudan, Oman and Somalia. Washington was

manifestly hastening with the aid of these maneuvers to demonstrate the United States' military presence in the region and thereby emphasize its intention of keeping Egypt in the stream of its Near East policy following the assassination of President as-Sadat.

The U.S. Congress' approval on 29 October 1981 of the sale to Saudi Arabia of five aircraft with an onboard warning and guidance system (AWACS) for a sum of \$8.5 billion also corresponded to the plans for militarization of the region. The terms of the deal were worded such that the use of the AWACS was to serve not so much the defense purpose of Saudi Arabia as to secure for the United States intelligence information concerning the armies of Arab states.

Israel's ruling circles and international Zionist organizations initiated a noisy campaign against this deal, and certain Western information organs also evaluated it as evidence of the United States' departure from the traditional policy of maintaining "special relations" with Tel Aviv. This show corresponded fully to Washington's interests inasmuch as one of its purposes in the deal was to create the appearance of the United States' "balanced" approach to both sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict. However, the first months of the new U.S. Administration's term in office even showed as clearly as could be that Israel's role in the United States' Near East policy had increased sharply. The antimonarchical revolution in Iran, the Arab states' negative reaction to the idea of a "strategic consensus" and the removal from the political arena of Egypt's President as-Sadat were perceived by Washington as new confirmation that Tel Aviv was its most dependable ally in the Near East. The conclusions were not slow to follow: military assistance to Israel increased, and, what is most important, there was increased U.S. support for its expansionist policy.

The Begin government took advantage of the patronage of the R. Reagan administration to step up the pace of preparations for annexation of the Arab territory occupied in 1967. Together with the intensive building of settlements and the confiscation of land from the Arabs new steps were taken to consolidate the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Endeavoring to impart "outward respectability" to the occupation regime on these territories, in November 1981 Tel Aviv played out the farce of the transition from a military to civilian administration: the occupiers changed military uniforms for civilian attire. Simultaneously repression against the local patriotic forces was stepped up. In the spring of 1982 the occupation authorities replaced many West Bank mayors, and some of them fell victim to Zionists' terrorist acts. In March-April 1982 the Israeli military put down a mass uprising of residents of the West Bank with extreme cruelty.

Despite the fact that the Arab countries openly made the United States responsible for the escalation of Israeli aggressiveness, the R. Reagan administration not only did not attempt to moderate the zeal of its "partner" but essentially encouraged it to new anti-Arab actions. This was manifested particularly distinctly in connection with the "Memorandum of Mutual Understanding Between the United States and Israel in the Sphere of Strategic Cooperation" which came to light in November 1981. The signing of the memorandum had been preceded by talks between Begin and Reagan in Washington,

in the course of which the sides reached agreement on a broad range of questions of "strategic cooperation". The problem of military cooperation was the main one on the agenda of their meeting. The United States underlined its commitment to build two air bases in the Negev for Israel as compensation for the Eitam and Etzion bases in Sinai which it had to leave in April 1982 in connection of the return of the peninsula to Egypt. Washington reserved for itself here the right to avail itself of the bases in the Negev. The memorandum provided for the planning and holding of joint maneuvers, the storing of American weapons on Israeli territory and an expansion of the volume of military supplies to Tel Aviv. Having signed this document, the R. Reagan administration officially proclaimed Israel its main ally in the Near East.

III

Tel Aviv perceived the "strategic cooperation" memorandum with Washington as a kind of carte blanche for continuation of the expansionist policy. In December 1981 even the Begin government extended Israeli legislation to the Golan Heights, which had been captured from Syria, which meant the actual annexation of these territories. The explosion of indignation in the Arab world caused by this unlawful act was so powerful that the White House, for the sake of salvaging its prestige in the region, was forced to declare the memorandum which had only just been signed "frozen". However, this step, as subsequent events showed, was of a purely formal nature. The cooperation of the "strategic partners" not only continued but assumed even greater proportions, serving as the source of a new tragedy for the Near East.

At the start of 1982 Israel began to prepare openly for aggression against Lebanon. The Reagan administration adopted an "understanding" attitude toward its partner's preparation of the latest adventure, hoping that it would create a situation in the region more conducive to the realization of American strategic designs. In fact the United States gave Tel Aviv the go-ahead for aggression in Lebanon during the visit to Washington in May 1982 of Sharon, who was at that time defense minister in the Begin cabinet. The White House believed that Israel would succeed in smashing the PLO and seriously weakening Syria in the course of a strike against its military contingent in Lebanon. Given this version of events, the forces operating in the vanguard of the Arab peoples' struggle against imperialism and Zionism would prove to have been "neutralized". The R. Reagan administration hoped that the conditions would thereby be created for a galvanization of the "Camp David process". It was counting here, first, on the assumption of power in Lebanon of a rightwing Christian government capable of signing a separate "peace" with Israel and, second, a weakening of the general Arab resistance to the American plan for a "settlement".

A central place in Washington's designs was occupied by hopes that Tel Aviv's Lebanon adventure would afford a prospect of the United States' expanded military presence in the Near East, most likely in the form of a contingent consisting of a "multinational force" sent in allegedly for the purpose of disengaging the combatants and ensuring Lebanon's security. The stationing

in Sinai in the wake of the withdrawal therefrom of Israeli forces in April 1983 of a "multinational force" of a total strength of 2,500 men, 1,200 of whom are American soldiers, was to have served as the precedent for this. It is highly indicative that the U.S. contingent in Sinai was formed from subunits of the "rapid deployment force" and deployed at strategically important points--on the island of Tiran at the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba and around Sharm ash-Shaykh.

From the first days of the invasion of Lebanon Tel Aviv relied on the broad political support of Washington, which attempted to portray the far-reaching aggression as a forced action of Israel's undertaken by the latter to ensure the "security" of its northern borders.* The fact that the PLO had observed unswervingly the cease-fire agreement reached in July 1981 and had not launched a single operation from Lebanese territory for 11 months was deliberately ignored here. Israel did not confine itself to concentrating troops close to the border with Lebanon but also made a number of attacks on this country (including the barbaric bombing of Beirut of 21 April 1981) as of the spring of 1981. All this was aimed at provoking the PLO to retaliatory operations and, having accused it of violating the cease-fire agreement, thereby acquiring the desired pretext for the start of the new military adventure.

During the aggression itself the United States exerted the maximum effort to neutralize the protests of the international public and ensure for its partner conditions conducive to the achievement in Lebanon of goals in which both Washington and Tel Aviv were interested. Availing itself of its veto in the UN Security Council, the United States vetoes a resolution demanding an end to military operations and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory.

Despite the fact that Israel had thrown a more than 100,000-strong army equipped with the latest weapons into Lebanon, it did not succeed, as it had hoped, in smashing the PLO subunits with a lightning strike and completing the "operation" as quickly as possible. From the first days the aggressor encountered the stubborn resistance of the Palestinians and Lebanese national-patriotic forces and, instead of a Blitzkrieg, it had to wage a long war, which was attended by considerable losses. Israel was unable either to wipe out or discredit the PLO. The attempts to strike a "crushing" blow at Syria on Lebanese territory were also unsuccessful.

Although the American-Israeli strategic goals remained identical, at the same time tactical disagreements were revealed between Washington and Tel Aviv in the course of the aggression. This applied to the Begin government's intentions of annexing areas of South Lebanon and "settling the Palestinian problem" by way of driving the Palestinians out of Lebanon and, possibly, striking subsequently at Jordan. Implementation of these intentions could have seriously complicated the United States' position in the Near East and completely undermined its relations with the conservative regimes.

* The Begin government hypocritically christened its aggressive action against Lebanon "Peace for Galilee" (the northern parts of Israel).

Under these conditions Washington was forced to undertake a diplomatic action which might blunt the outburst of Arab anger at the events which had taken place and contribute to the restoration of American prestige in the region. Furthermore, the White House assumed that as a result of the Lebanese war a situation had taken shape conducive to the advancement of the American plan for a "settlement" of the Near East conflict. Hopes were built here on the fact that the anti-imperialist forces of the Arab world, primarily Syria and the PLO, had been weakened and would not be able to counteract the United States. The R. Reagan administration hoped that in putting forward the new "peace" plan it would be able to monopolize the settlement process and remove the Soviet Union from it. Washington also counted on expanding the opportunities for maneuver in the Arab world in order subsequently to return to the plans for involving certain Arab regimes in the orbit of the strict global confrontation with the USSR being developed by the United States.

All these considerations determined the appearance on 1 September 1982 of a new American "initiative"--the "Reagan Plan". From the viewpoint of the general American approach to conflict situations this "initiative" signified Washington's return to the idea of the settlement of the Near East conflict whereby the United States exclusively would dictate its terms. Endeavoring to create the appearance of "distancing itself" from the utterly candid Israeli policy of expansion and aggression, the White House included in its plan very modest hints at disagreement, first, with the annexationist designs of the Begin government and, second, with the unlimited building of Israeli settlements on occupied Arab territory.

As far as the American "prescriptions" for a solution of the Palestinian problem were concerned, they were not distinguished by novelty and were formulated with regard primarily for the interests of Tel Aviv. The basis of the "solution" contained in the plan was the idea of the "association of the West Bank and Gaza with Jordan," which had been put forward prior to Reagan entering the White House. Essentially this idea was nothing other than a conditional formula adopted by American diplomacy to camouflage a refusal to satisfy the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to create their own independent state. It is highly indicative that the "Reagan Plan" lacks even a mention of the PLO. The "plan's" anti-Arab emphasis is also manifested distinctly in the indications of the need to provide in the future for Israel's ties to the West Bank and the preservation of the militarized settlements which already exist.

The pro-Israel thrust of the "Reagan Plan" determined the negative attitude toward it of the majority of Arab states and the PLO. Washington's hopes of uncoupling the Arab world and, accordingly, winning Arab's approval for its "peace" plan proved groundless also. The pan-Arab summit in Fez at the start of September 1982 confirmed the closeness of the Arab states' opinions on a whole number of vitally important issues, primarily concerning ways to normalize the situation in the region. The plan for a settlement of the Near East conflict approved by all those taking part in the meetings was a constructive alternative to the American "peace" plan. The very adoption thereof literally a few days after the appearance of the "Reagan Plan" was a kind of Pan-Arab response to Washington for its new "initiative".

Demonstrating its "equality" in the alliance existing between it and the United States, Israel opposed the "Reagan Plan" inasmuch as this document created the appearance of the possibility of Arab sovereignty over the West Bank and Gaza and was contrary to the policy of the Begin government of the unlimited building of new settlements. In connection with Washington's diplomatic maneuvers of the fall of 1982 Tel Aviv noticeably stepped up its efforts to expand the network of settlements on the occupied territory, endeavoring thus to block the prospect of any solution unsuitable to it. The American TIME magazine noted without sarcasm that "the more President Reagan expressed discontent at the new settlements on the West Bank, the more quickly the Israelis built them."* Israel was able to pursue such a policy solely thanks to the fact that the American declarations remained empty phrases unsupported by any practical steps. Furthermore, to please his "strategic partner" President Reagan subsequently even removed clauses of his plan which irritated Israel and now declared that the Israeli settlements "are not an obstacle to peace."

Israel's ruling circles acknowledge with cynical candor that the policy of colonization of the captured Arab territory which they are pursuing is aimed at changing the demographic composition of the population. This is intended, according to their calculations, to open a prospect for annexation based on a fait accompli. Of the approximately 140 Israeli militarized settlements, 71 were built following the conclusion of the Camp David agreements. It is planned to have built a further 57 settlements by 1987. Up to 30,000 Israelis are currently living on the West Bank and in Gaza. Plans for the future provide for an increase in the number of settlers to 1.3 million.** The policy of terror against the indigenous population of these territories which is openly being pursued by the Israeli authorities is also subordinated to the goals of preparing the conditions for annexation of the occupied territories. The killing of peaceful Palestinian inhabitants, bestial reprisals and unwarranted arrests have become a daily occurrence here. As a rule, the crimes of the Zionist extremists against the Arabs go unpunished. The British magazine MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL wrote in this connection: "Even Israeli liberals are now beginning to ask themselves whether the Israeli establishment wishes to pursue the criminals perpetrating crimes against the Arabs."***

In Israel itself the aggressive, expansionist policy of its rulers is causing the growing discontent of broad strata of the population. An explosion of antiwar sentiments was caused by the Begin government's adventure in Lebanon. A 400,000-strong demonstration, which was unprecedented in terms of the number of participants, took place in September 1982 in Tel Aviv demanding an end to the aggression and a thorough investigation of the massacre of Palestinians in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps which had been organized by the Israeli military. The Peace Now movement, which has been in existence since 1978, stepped up its activity noticeably. A whole number of new antiwar organizations arose. For the first time in Israel's history soldiers and officers began to join in the protests against the government's aggressive policy, and they even formed their own organization--There Is a Limit--and a number of others, which are participating actively in the antiwar movement.

* TIME, 21 February 1983, p 15.

** See LE MONDE, 12 April 1983.

*** MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL, 5 August 1983, p 8.

The Lebanon adventure has cost the country more than \$1 billion, sharply exacerbating Israel's already grave economic situation. In 1983 total military spending, including expenditure on maintaining an army of occupation in Lebanon, constituted two-thirds of the budget and the level of inflation reached the record mark of 190 percent, and in 1984 could reach, according to the estimates of Israeli economists, 280 percent. The balance of trade deficit last year amounted to \$5.35 billion, while the country's total foreign debt amounted to \$28 billion. In attempts to overcome the acute economic crisis Israeli Finance Minister Y. Cohen-Orgad presented in December 1983 a plan for a reduction in budget appropriations of \$1 billion at the expense primarily of spending not on the army and the colonization of the occupied territories but on education and social needs. As a result of this policy the number of Israelis living below the "official poverty level" has reached half a million. A strike movement has been growing in the country recently. Full, partial and warning strikes have occurred in the ministries of defense and the interior even. Fleeing the economic crisis, an increasingly large number of Israelis is quitting the "Zionist paradise". As the London TIMES believes, an even greater number of its citizens (compared with last year)--up to 100,000--will emigrate from Israel in 1984.

Endeavoring to prevent the economic collapse of its "strategic partner," Washington is increasing the amount of financial aid to Israel. Since 1948 the United States has granted it more than \$25 billion. In 1984 the amount of American assistance will constitute \$2.61 billion, including \$1.7 billion in the form of military credit.

IV

American diplomacy deferred implementation of the "Reagan Plan" until the solution of the "Lebanese problem," hoping that a settlement of the situation in Lebanon on American terms would create favorable conditions for the advancement of this "plan". President Reagan's personal representative, P. Habib, who throughout the first months of 1983 persistently attempted to incline the Lebanese Government toward reaching an accord which would be primarily to Israel's liking, was sent to the Near East.

U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz arrived in the Near East in May 1983 with the task of speeding up the achievement of a "peace treaty" between Lebanon and Israel. Such an agreement was signed shortly after. It formally declared an end to the state of war between the two countries. In accordance with its terms, it was proposed creating a 45-kilometer "security zone" in South Lebanon which would provide for an Israeli military presence. The agreement stipulated the banning of anti-Israel propaganda by the Lebanese mass media. The terms of the agreement seriously infringed Lebanon's sovereignty and its natural relations with the Arab world inasmuch as they required of it a renunciation of the treaties concluded within the Arab League framework, primarily the Arab Defense Pact. The agreement in fact presupposed the establishment of an Israeli protectorate over Lebanon and the strengthening of Tel Aviv's positions in this country, which created a serious threat to Syria's security. It has to be stressed that this agreement represented in practice a substitution of the corresponding UN decisions concerning a normalization of the situation in Lebanon and demanding the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor's forces.

Simultaneously with the Israeli-Lebanese "peace treaty" a secret agreement was signed between the United States and Israel in accordance with which, according to reports which were leaked to the press, Tel Aviv obtained freedom of maneuver for new aggressive actions on Lebanese territory, while the United States once again undertook not to conduct any negotiations with the PLO and to lift its "objections" to new Israeli settlements on the occupied territories. Israel was also granted the American licenses necessary for producing the multipurpose Lavi fighter bomber. The United States lifted the "embargo" on the supply of 75 F-16 fighter bombers to Tel Aviv.

The Israeli-Lebanese agreement was rejected by many national and religious groups of Lebanon's population, parties and organizations. It exacerbated even further the domestic political situation in the country. The emphasis on preservation of the dominant positions in Lebanon's political structures of the rightwing Christians caused the sharp discontent of other religious and ethnic groups of the population, whose political rights were infringed. The seriousness of the situation was intensified by the fact that Israel was absolutely not about to withdraw its occupying forces from Lebanon and had already begun the active assimilation of the south of the country. Shortly after the signing of the agreement, Israeli forces were redeployed from the Chouf mountain region to the line of the Awali River, but this was done in connection with the fact that they were sustaining heavy losses there as a result of the guerrilla operations. Tel Aviv, in unison with Washington, subsequently used the troop redeployment to further incite intercommunal discord and to strike at Lebanon's national-patriotic forces.

Not having achieved results either in a Lebanon settlement or in advancement of the "Reagan Plan," the White House again put the emphasis on power methods in its Near East policy. The American forces in Lebanon and the ships of the U.S. Navy plying this country's territorial waters began to coordinate their operations directly with the Israeli army of occupation. They joined actively in military operations against Lebanon's national-patriotic forces and Syrian troops. The original length of the U.S. marines' stay in Lebanon was put at "30 days". It was then extended to "18 months," which attested Washington's endeavor to transfer their presence here to a permanent footing. Within the framework of its tough policy the R. Reagan administration stepped up the military pressure on the Syrian forces on Lebanese territory, pushing Tel Aviv toward war with Syria. Former Israeli Foreign Minister A. Eban acknowledged that the "American friends" advised Israel in every possible way to start a real war with Syria.* American aircraft and long-range artillery continued the bombing and shelling of the positions of Syrian troops and detachments of Lebanon's national-patriotic forces. The number of casualties among the peaceful population grew, and many centers of population were turned into ruins.

The escalation of the American forces' military operations was not fortuitously connected with the negotiations which Shamir, the present Israeli prime minister, conducted at the end of November 1983 in the White House. An understanding providing for the onset of a "new era" in American-Israeli relations and even closer military-strategic cooperation was essentially made officials in the course of his visit. The creation on a permanent basis of a military-political committee of representatives of the two countries which would undertake the planning and staging of joint maneuvers, the deployment and

* See THE JERUSALEM POST INTERNATIONAL, 6-12 November 1983.

stockpiling of American weapons and equipment on Israeli territory and an exchange of intelligence data was contemplated. The sides agreed on the U.S. Navy's use of Israeli ports and also on the granting of the most modern offensive weapons to Tel Aviv.

The results of Shamir's talks in Washington were evaluated throughout the world, in the Arab countries included, unequivocally: the United States had conclusively and irreversibly thrown off the mask of "peacemaker" allegedly attempting to pursue a "balanced" policy between Israel and the Arabs. The agreement which was reached was not simply a galvanization of the memorandum of 30 November 1981; the cooperation and coordination of the operations of the two countries were henceforward raised to a new, higher level.

This change in U.S. policy was not fortuitous but had been long in preparation. First Washington, together with Tel Aviv, under the cover of American "peace" efforts and initiatives frustrated the convening of a Geneva conference on a Near East settlement and blocked the search for ways of a just solution of the conflict. With the help of the separate Camp David deal the biggest Arab country--Egypt--was withdrawn from the pan-Arab confrontation with Israel, which took advantage of this situation to attack Lebanon. U.S. troops appeared in Sinai and subsequently in Lebanon. The Iran-Iraq war, in the course of which the two states' human and natural resources are being insanely squandered, deepened even more the rift between the Arab countries and contributed to the further destabilization of the situation in the Near East.

The new accords between Washington and Tel Aviv promise the Arab peoples increased U.S. interference in the affairs of the region and an escalation of the Israeli policy of aggression and expansionism with America's active support and participation. The real threat hanging over the Arab world demands the surmounting of inter-Arab conflicts and the cohesion and close cooperation of the forces opposed to aggression.

The intrigues of imperialism aimed at undermining the cohesion of the ranks of the PLO in order to deprive it of the status of sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and ultimately remove it from the Near East political arena, which were stepped up following the Israeli aggression in Lebanon, also represent a serious danger. Recently reaction has been concentrating its efforts on imposing the "Reagan Plan" on the Palestinians and, correspondingly, compelling them to capitulate to the Zionist aggressors.

The courageous struggle of the Lebanese patriots and Syria's stanchness are creating serious obstacles in the way of realization of the American-Israeli designs in respect of the region. The U.S. marines had to relocate to the warships off Lebanon's coast. On 4 March 1984 Beirut abrogated the "peace agreement" with Israel which had been foisted on it last year. All Lebanese political forces, with the exception of the far right Christian groupings, and the Arab world approved the renunciation of this crippling agreement. American imperialism has suffered a serious defeat in the Near East. However, Washington and Tel Aviv, as their operations in Lebanon have shown, have not learned the proper lessons from these events. American naval assault forces remain off the coast of the sovereign Arab country and, judging by statements from the

White House, intend to continue to interfere in its internal affairs. The Israeli interventionists are threatening to expand their aggressive operations and are not contemplating withdrawing from occupied South Lebanon.

The hegemonist policy of the United States is opposed by that of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries, which advocate a just solution of the Near East problem in the interests of all states and peoples of the region. The USSR consistently supports the sovereignty, independence and unity of Lebanon and advocates a settlement of domestic political disagreements by way of the peaceful dialogue of the various sides, without the military-political interference of the United States and its closest NATO allies, and unconditional fulfillment of UN resolutions demanding the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory. The Soviet Union invariably supports the Syrian Arab Republic, which is opposing the intrigues in the region of the forces of imperialism and Zionism. As emphasized in the Soviet-Syrian communique on the results of a working visit to the Syrian Arab Republic by G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, "The Soviet Union values highly Syria's consistent position in Near East affairs and its effective contribution to counteracting the American-Israeli attempts to compel the Arab peoples to adopt crippling terms of a settlement and take the path of separate deals." The Palestinian people's courageous struggle for their legitimate rights has won Soviet people's profound sympathies. "The realization of the Palestinians' national aspirations," the communique goes on to say, "is impossible without observance of the decisions of the Palestine National Council aimed at counteracting Israeli aggression and the Camp David policy of separate deals, including the 'Reagan Plan,' and without the PLO's close cooperation with Syria and all progressive Arab states and patriotic forces of the Arab world."

The USSR believes that a lasting, just peace in the Near East may be achieved only on condition of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territory occupied in 1967, realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including the right to form their own state, and the secure and independent existence and development of all states of the region. The Soviet Union has also proposed the mechanism for such an all-embracing settlement--the convening of a special international conference on the Near East with the participation of all interested parties.

The Soviet proposals have been broadly supported throughout the world, particularly at the International Conference on Realization of the Inalienable Rights of the Arab People of Palestine which was held in Geneva last year. The UN General Assembly 38th Session passed a resolution on the Near East providing for the convening of an international conference which would tackle the problem of an all-embracing, just settlement. The joint efforts of all the world's peace-loving forces are capable of frustrating the plans of the most reactionary circles of imperialism throughout the world, in the Near East included.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF WORLD POLITICS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 82-101

[V. Babak, V. Valdimirov, K. Nikolayev international roundup: "Current Problems of World Politics"]

[Excerpts] The start of the 1980's has been marked by an unprecedented exacerbation of class confrontation and ideological struggle in the international arena and of the two opposed courses in interstate relations. The frontier of 1983 and 1984 was packed to the limit with events of varying levels in terms of scale, content and significance reflecting and embodying the actual course and vital dynamics of this confrontation.

The forces of international reaction continued their proclaimed "crusade" in vain attempts to hold and turn back man's forward progress. Their actions have inflamed the international situation to the utmost and led to a palpable growth of the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war. The question of the protection of people's future and life on Earth itself has assumed particular seriousness and urgency in this connection.

But the scale of the danger emanating from imperialism and the growing recognition thereof by the peoples have contributed to the increased dimensions of the antimilitarist, anti-imperialist movement and a strengthening of the cohesion of its ranks. Despite the entire complexity and ambiguity of the international life of this period, the fact that the forces of socialism, progress and peace as a whole kept a constant hold of the strategic initiative and successfully opposed the military-force pressure of imperialism remains what is most important and determining therein.

In the Socialist World

Under the leadership of the fraternal communist and workers parties the peoples of the socialist community countries are continuing to advance successfully along the path of socialist and communist building and winning new victories here.

CEMA celebrated its 35th birthday in January 1984. The formation of CEMA was the result of persevering and consistent efforts of the CPSU and the fraternal communist and workers parties. This work led to impressive results. With

10 percent of the world's population the CEMA countries currently possess one-third of world industrial and scientific-technical potential, and they account for one-third of world industrial and scientific-technical potential, and they account for one-fourth of the national income derived in the world and one-fifth of world agricultural production. The economy of these states is developing in stable manner and at a high rate. Thus in the period 1950-1982 the CEMA countries' national income grew by a factor of 8.3, while in the EEC it grew by a factor of 3.3, industrial production grew by factors of 13.2 and 3.7 respectively and agricultural production by factors of 2.5 and 2. Together with the absolute growth there was also an increase in the CEMA states' share of the world production of the most important types of product. In the same period it rose from 14 to 21 percent in power engineering, from 8 to 24 percent in respect of oil and gas condensate, from 5 to 34 percent in terms of natural gas and from 19 to 32 percent in terms of steel.

The economic cooperation of the socialist countries had undergone profound quantitative and qualitative transformations in these decades. Initially it was organized on the basis of the development of reciprocal trade. The year of 1956 was the first year of cooperation based on coordination of 5-year national economic plans, which immediately imparted additional dynamism to this cooperation and increased the returns therefrom: reciprocal commodity turnover rose from R4.5 billion in 1950 to more than R160 billion in 1983.

A big event in the life of CEMA was its 23d (special) session (April 1969), which adopted the policy of the development of socialist economic integration. This strategic line was enshrined in the Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration, which was unanimously approved by the participants in the 25th CEMA Session in July 1971. The next important step in the development of socialist economic integration was the adoption in 1978 and 1979 of long-term goal-oriented cooperation programs, which determined the concerted strategy of the economic interaction of the community countries up to 1990. Such programs have been adopted and are being implemented in all the most important spheres of the economy: fuel, energy and raw material, engineering, agriculture and food industry, production of consumer goods and transportation. They are providing reliable reference points for tackling new socioeconomic tasks.

The 26th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the other fraternal parties noted the need for transition to the next stage of cooperation--coordination of economic policy as a whole. This new step is making fundamental changes to the coordination of national economic plans. The socialist CEMA states are now coordinating plans on the basis of the 1986-1990 plan-coordination program adopted by the 36th CEMA Session in 1982. Efforts are being concentrated in the most priority areas of cooperation and on the accomplishment of the tasks of increasing the efficiency of economic relations and the intensification of the national economies. Even today these relations have a big place in the national economy of each socialist country. Thus in 1982 the CEMA countries' reciprocal trade satisfied 68 percent of their machinery and equipment import requirements, 61 percent of fuel, mineral raw material and metal requirements, 46 percent of food requirements and 61 percent of industrial consumer goods requirements.

Against the background of the difficulties which the economy of the nonsocialist part of the world continued to experience in 1983 as a whole, the economy of the socialist countries was distinguished by dynamism and stability. The plenums of the communist and workers party central committees and sessions of the legislatures of the CEMA members at the end of 1983 summed up the preliminary results of the year's work and studied and approved the plans for 1984. A characteristic feature of the latter is that they are aimed at consolidating the positive results of 1983 in the sphere of the economy, a further intensification of social production and an increase in its efficiency and the people's well-being.

In Bulgaria derived national income increased by an average of 4.6 percent annually in 1981-1983 compared with the 3.7 percent outlined by the current 5-year plan, and industrial production here grew by an average of 5.1 percent and agricultural production by 3.5 percent. Wages increased 11 percent in 1983 compared with 1980 (all data are preliminary). The 1984 national economic plan provides for 3.8-percent growth of national income, a social labor productivity growth of 4 percent, industrial production growth of 5 percent and agricultural growth of 3.1 percent. Real income per capita will increase 2.5 percent and the social consumption funds 3.3 percent.

Despite the very severe drought which gripped the country in 1983, as a whole Hungary completed the year with results in line with the most important tasks of the national economic plan. Industrial production grew 1.4-1.5 percent, which corresponds to the plan targets. The gross agricultural product as a whole reached the 1982 level. The indicators of real income and consumption of the population also remained at the 1982 level. A 1.5-2-percent increase in national income and industrial production is outlined for 1984. In agriculture the set task is ensuring that the 1982 production volume is maintained in plant growing and surpassed in animal husbandry. The cereals harvest, in particular, will constitute no less than 1.4 tons per capita--one of the highest indicators in the world. The population's monetary income will increase, with regard for social payments, almost 8 percent.

Pronounced successes in the development of the basic sectors of the national economy were scored in Vietnam, where the average annual rate of increase in the production of food crops constituted 10 percent. A record harvest of these crops was gathered in in 1983--17 million tons. In 1984 it is planned to increase the volume of agricultural production 7 percent, industrial production 9.5 percent and labor productivity per industrial worker 5 percent.

The economy of the GDR, where in 1983 the industrial production growth rate surpassed the planned rate, is developing in stable manner. Marked successes were scored in ensuring the more rational use of raw material, energy and intermediate products: their annual consumption per unit industrial product declined 7 percent. The drought was reflected in the potato and sugar beet harvests, but over 10 million tons of cereals were gathered in. In 1984 the increase in national income is to constitute 4.4 percent, in industrial production 4.2 percent, in plant growing 8.4 percent and in meat production (dressed weight) 5.1 percent. The population's monetary income and marketable funds will grow noticeably.

On 1 January 1984 the working people of Cuba and all progressive mankind commemorated the 25th anniversary of the revolution which opened to the people of this country the way of creation and development. Under the harshest conditions, determined by proximity to the main citadel of imperialism, incessant provocations on the part of the United States, its subversive activity and constant threat of aggression, the Cuban working people are building socialism. Their accomplishments are all the more impressive. All the more graphic, particularly with respect to the peoples of Latin America, is the inspiring example of emancipated labor and the advantage of socialism.

More than 1,100 industrial enterprises (including about 170 in key sectors of the national economy with the USSR's assistance) have been built and new sectors of industry have been created on the island of freedom in the past 25 years. Engineering and metal-working products grew (in terms of value) from 29 million pesos in 1958 to almost 900 million pesos in 1982. Steel production increased from 24,000 to 301,000 tons a year. The production of nickel-cobalt concentrate (an important export product) from 12,500 to 41,000 tons; and electric power generation from 2.55 billion to 11 billion kilowatt-hours.

The successes of Cuban agriculture are also very considerable. Given the continued high level of the production of sugar--the traditional export product, which prior to the revolution constituted the basis of the island's monoculture economy--the production of food crops important for the diet has increased many times over. The production of rice (520,000 tons in 1982) and vegetables has more than doubled in 25 years, and 7 times more citrus fruit is being harvested now. Cuba has raised the production of mineral fertilizers by a factor of 6.6 and the fish catch by a factor of almost 9.

The country's gross social product more than doubled in the period 1972-1982 alone. Tremendous changes also occurred in the social sphere and in surmounting the former poverty and illiteracy on the basis of the economic achievements.

The year of 1983 was also a good one for Cuba. According to preliminary data, the gross social product grew 5 percent and labor productivity 3.5 percent. Pretty good indicators were achieved in agriculture, despite the natural disasters which hit Cuba at the start of last year. Approved by a session of the National Assembly of the people's power, the uniform plan of socioeconomic development for 1984 provides for a further increase in national income of 5.5-6 percent and in labor productivity of 2.5-3 percent. Appropriations for such social purposes as education and health care will increase considerably--5.1 and 14.3 percent respectively.

In Mongolia the results of 1983 in agriculture were considerably higher than the indicators of the preceding year and in industry they outstripped both what was achieved in 1982 and the plan outlines. Provision of the working people with all the basic types of consumer goods improved. According to the plan for the current year, the growth of national income will constitute 6 percent, industrial production 7.3 percent and agricultural production 9 percent. More than 60,000 hectares of virgin land will be developed.

Describing the situation in Poland, W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee, emphasized that the difficult, but now manifest process of a way out of the economic slump is continuing. The most important areas and frontiers of this process are determined by the plan for 1983-1985. According to preliminary estimates, for the first time in the last 4 years a certain increase in national income is expected in the country's national economy in 1983. Industrial production will grow by 4.5-5 percent. High results were achieved in the coal industry (190 million tons of coal in 1983). More than 22 million tons of cereals were harvested. For the first time in the past several years there was an increase in newly built apartments. The 1984 plan provides for an increase in national income of 3.5 percent, in industrial production of 4.5-5.5 percent and in agricultural production of 1.4-1.8 percent.

Polish leaders emphasize that an increasingly large number of working people is accepting the party's arguments and believes in its capacity for ensuring the country's security, guaranteeing dependable alliances which are fundamental for Poland and continuing to successfully overcome the consequences of the economic crisis. W. Jaruzelski termed the strengthening of Poland's positions in the socialist community and the decisive expansion of cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries a most important achievement of the past 2 years.

In 10 months of 1973 industrial production in Romania increased in gross terms by approximately 5 percent with a labor productivity growth of 4 percent. A difficult situation developed in the country's agriculture and hydraulic engineering owing to the lack of snow of the 1982-1983 winter and the unusually arid summer. The plan for the current year provides for a further increase in the basic indicators of the national economy: in the gross social product by 4.6 percent and in industrial commodity output (in terms of value) by 6.7 percent.

The visit to Romania from 30 January through 1 February 1984 of a party-government delegation of the USSR headed by A.A. Gromyko was a major event in Soviet-Romanian relations of recent times. N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, received the delegation and had talks with it. The sides noted the ongoing development of bilateral relations, emphasized the importance of the further strengthening of all-around economic cooperation between CEMA countries and exchanged opinions on important international issues. The USSR and Romania declared the need to increase efforts in order to halt the negative development of events, put an end to the arms race and switch to disarmament, nuclear particularly. The two states' interest in contributing in every possible way to the continuation of the process begun by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, including the success of the Stockholm conference, was declared.

A certain acceleration of the economic growth rate was observed in 1983 in Czechoslovakia. National income grew 2.2 percent, industrial production 2.6 percent and the population's real income 2.4 percent. The 1984 plan provides for an increase in national income of 3 percent, in labor productivity of 2.6 percent and industrial production of 2.9 percent. The national economic plan

of the CSSR, like similar documents of the other socialist countries, emphasizes particularly the accelerated introduction of the latest achievements of scientific-technical progress, the most rational use of energy and raw material resources and production capacity, an expansion of housing construction and the development of all-around cooperation with the fraternal countries.

A working friendly visit to the USSR was paid from 27 February through 1 March 1984 by V. Zarkovic, vice president of the Yugoslav Presidium, and the persons accompanying him. V. Zarkovic was received by K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In the course of the conversation and also the negotiations in Moscow there was an exchange of opinions on questions of Soviet-Yugoslav relations and certain urgent international problems. Mutual interest in the further development of relations between the CPSU and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the USSR and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was expressed. A high evaluation was made, in particular, of economic and scientific-technical cooperation, which is being developed comprehensively on a long-term mutually profitable and stable basis.

The success of the cause of preserving and strengthening peace, a CPSU Central Committee special plenum emphasized, depends to a considerable extent on how great the influence in the world arena of the socialist countries is and how assertive, purposeful and concerted their actions are. "In comprehensively developing and deepening cohesion and cooperation with the socialist community countries in all spheres, including, of course, such an important sphere as the economic sphere," K.U. Chernenko says, "we are thereby making a big contribution to the cause of peace, progress and the security of the peoples."

Preliminary data on fulfillment of the 1983 economic plan, which as a whole testify to a growth of production in a number of sectors, have been published in China. Thus almost 40 million tons of steel, approximately 700 million tons of coal and 106 million tons of oil were produced. The production of rolled metal, cement and chemical fertilizers, the grain harvest and cotton production increased. At the same time a decline in the production of certain types of product was observed, while with respect to others the high figures of increase conceal absolute values testifying merely to a return to the indicators which had been achieved by the Chinese economy earlier. Serious disproportions remain in the country's national economy, and many financial and economic problems have not been solved. The journal BAN YUE TAN, which is authoritative in the PRC, noted, describing the general results of 1983, that despite the economic growth rate which had been achieved, "economic efficiency is inadequate."

According to an NCNA report, in accordance with the outlines of the current, sixth, five-year plan for 1981-1985, the volumes of industrial and agricultural production are to increase 4-5 percent in 1984. A pronounced role continues to be assigned the attraction of foreign capital. Agreements on the building with its participation of a further 30 enterprises were concluded in 1983. The PRC currently has 112 such enterprises. Last September they were granted additional tax concessions and currency and commercial transaction privileges.

Certain positive changes in Soviet-Chinese relations have been observed recently. An agreement between the governments of the USSR and the PRC on commodity turnover and payments for 1984, which outlines a considerable expansion of trade in terms of volume and product mix, was signed at the start of this year in Beijing. Total trade volume in 1984 will constitute approximately R1 billion or will increase 60 percent compared with 1983. The prospects of the expansion of bilateral commercial-economic relations were discussed during the negotiations.

The USSR, as the leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state have emphasized repeatedly, has invariably supported and continues to support a further improvement in relations with the PRC. The positive development of Soviet-Chinese relations is not to the liking merely of the forces which would like to benefit from the absence of normal mutual relations between our country and China. As far as the Soviet and Chinese peoples are concerned, they could only gain from such an improvement. The political climate in the world as a whole would also gain; socialism's role in the international arena would also be enhanced.

The most notable event in the PRC's foreign policy in the period in question was the trip of Zhao Ziyang, premier of the PRC State Council, to the United States, where from 7 through 16 January 1984 he held talks with President R. Reagan, Secretary of State G. Shultz and Defense Secretary C. Weinberger. Questions of bilateral relations and problems of the international situation were discussed, and two agreements--on industrial and scientific-technical cooperation--were signed.

Commenting on the results of the visit, many foreign observers note that both sides deliberately endeavored to blunt the political differences which exist between them, particularly on the Taiwan problem, which is such a delicate issue for both of them, and concentrate efforts on commercial-economic and scientific-technical relations. Washington was particularly insistent in pushing through such an interpretation of the course and results of the negotiations. However, it was not successful in concealing the existence of potentially explosive problems in bilateral relations. The R. Reagan government is emphatically pursuing a "two Chinas" line. On the very day that the U.S. President was ceremonially welcoming the high Chinese guest at the White House the head of a representative delegation of the U.S. Congress, M. Hatfield, declared on arrival on Taiwan that U.S. military assistance to "America's long-standing friends"--the Kuomintang--would be granted in 1984 in the same volume as in the past and that the development of American-Chinese (PRC--author) relations by no means signifies a winding down of the United States' relations with Taiwan. For its part, the PRC recalls that, despite identical or close views on some issues, China and the United States have differences on others and in recent months has stepped up somewhat its criticism of America's policy in Central America, the Near East and Southern Africa. The foreign press claims, however, that China is loudest in its criticism of the aspects of U.S. foreign policy which are not of direct significance for Beijing, but continues to adhere to views "paralleling" those of the United States on relations with the USSR and also on the situation surrounding Afghanistan and in Indochina.

Against the Policy of Aggression and Diktat

Recent months have been marked by new tragic events in long-suffering Lebanon. The exacerbation of differences within the Palestine resistance movement was a consequence of the continuing American-Israeli aggression against this small Arab country. Having arisen on the basis of different approaches to the question of methods of struggle for a just solution of the Palestine problem, they brought about, as has been the case in the past also, unfortunately, armed clashes between the Palestinians themselves. The unnatural, senseless struggle led to new casualties in the ranks of the Palestinian fighters. It also carried away many lives of peaceful Palestinian refugees, who had taken refuge in the area of the North Lebanese city of Tripoli. On 20 December 4,000 Palestinian fighters were forced to evacuate from Lebanon.

Under the conditions of Israel's continued occupation of a considerable part of Lebanese territory and the United States' direct armed interference in the affairs of this country such internecine strife is not only weakening the Palestine movement's own positions, it is impeding the formation of a pan-Arab front for struggle against the aggression of the United States and Israel against Lebanon. The discord in the ranks of the PLO is causing sincere concern in the friends of the Palestinian people and Arab countries. As the Algerian newspaper EL-MOUDJAHID observed, "following the bloody and grievous events in the Lebanese city of Tripoli and its suburbs and following the evacuation from there of Y. Arafat's subunits, the PLO is confronted with the difficult and urgent task of restoring the unity and cohesion of its ranks. We would like to believe that on this occasion also it will be tackled successfully for the future of the Palestinian people is at stake."

The United States has markedly extended the scale of the undeclared war in Lebanon. It has concentrated off the shores of this country a giant naval fleet with 30,000 servicemen and 300 aircraft. At the start of December, shortly after the visit of the new Israeli prime minister to Washington, which strengthened even more the two countries' military-strategic cooperation directed against the Arabs, the American military subjected the Druze regions of the Lebanese mountains, the southern outskirts of Beirut and other parts of the country to intensive shelling. The escalation of aggressive operations in Lebanon undertaken on the instructions of the White House confirmed as clearly as could be that Washington has finally discarded the mask of "impartial mediator" in the Arab-Israeli conflict and has openly adopted a policy of military-force pressure in respect of the progressive forces of the Arab East. A statement made by Y. Shamir on his return from the United States testifies to this. "We agreed," he said, "on the creation of a joint military-political committee which as of the start of next January (1984--author) will embark on the development of the principles of Israeli-American cooperation and coordination of action in respect of the entire set of unresolved problems in the Near East." The agreement on political, strategic and economic cooperation officialized during Y. Shamir's visit to Washington, the London FINANCIAL TIMES observes, in practice affords Israel unlimited possibilities in the implementation of policy in respect of the Arab neighbors. It is in fact a policy of aggression based on military, political and economic assistance of the transatlantic patron rendered without any conditions on the part of the United States.

The military-strategic alliance of the United States and Israel aimed against the Arab peoples has encountered emphatic condemnation not only on the part of the Arabs but also broad circles of the international community. In December, on the final day of the UN General Assembly 38th Session, the representatives of 81 UN member states voted for a resolution condemning the "strategic cooperation" between the United States and Israel and demanded that the United States refrain from strengthening Israel's military potential, which is prompting it to aggressive acts against its neighbors. The U.S. Administration's entire Near East policy was in fact condemned.

In January-February 1984 ships of the U.S. 6th Fleet, assembled off the Lebanese coast, repeatedly shelled the positions of the national-patriotic forces and Muslim population centers. The aggressive actions of the American military were coordinated with the provocations of the Israeli occupation forces aimed against the Lebanese patriots. The situation in the country became even more complicated as a result of the increasing foreign interference.

In mid-February detachments of the Progressive Socialist Party, relying on the support of the Druze population, inflicted a serious defeat on the militia of the rightwing Christian parties and Lebanese Army subunits operating on its side. Together with armed formations of Shi'ite Muslims (Amal) they took control of a number of strategically important centers of population, including the village of (Khalde) south of Beirut. There was fierce fighting in the capital itself along the so-called Green Line, which divides the city in two. Press agencies and the foreign press note the mass desertion of servicemen from the Lebanese Army unwilling to participate in a fratricidal war. Of the 10 Lebanese armed forces' brigades, four refused to conduct combat operations against the national-patriotic forces. As a result of the bitter fighting in mid-February the zone controlled by the national-patriotic forces expanded. As emphasized during a meeting of the leadership of the Lebanese Communist Party and the Progressive Socialist Party, the successes of the national-patriotic forces were an important stage of the struggle against the Israeli occupation and the American armed presence in Lebanon and have created the prerequisites for a just political settlement.

The staunchness of Lebanon's national-patriotic forces performed a definite role in the decision of the British, Italian and French governments to withdraw or considerably reduce their armed contingents which were a part of the so-called "multinational force". The U.S. Administration also was forced to announce the transfer of its forces from Beirut to the ships off the Lebanese coast. Some American marines remained in the Lebanese capital here. The essence of this maneuver of Washington's was revealed by President R. Reagan himself, who declared at a press conference: "At the present time we are carrying out a redeployment of the forces. Bear in mind, we are not withdrawing, we are simply transferring to other positions which are somewhat easier to defend."

The Lebanese patriotic forces demanded the cancellation of the Lebanese-Israeli separate "peace agreement" of 17 May 1983, which was imposed by the United States and Israel and which infringes the national sovereignty and does not correspond to the national interests of the country. Under the conditions of political crisis which had gripped the state and the defeat of the Lebanese

Army by the national-patriotic forces Lebanese Foreign Minister E. Salem expounded to representatives of the press on 17 February 1984 a new plan for a settlement of the Lebanese crisis. In particular, the plan provided for a cease-fire, abrogation of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, a resumption of the Geneva conference on national reconciliation, the creation of a government of national unity, the withdrawal from Lebanon within 3 months of Israeli and other foreign forces and "security measures" in South Lebanon for protection of Israel's northern border. The latter, as is known, is using the demand for "security" as a pretext for the occupation of South Lebanon.

The Lebanese opposition forces and also the Syrian Government emphatically rejected this plan inasmuch as it puts the Israeli occupation forces and the Syrian military contingent, which is in Lebanon following a decision of the Arab League, on the same footing. Furthermore, as a statement of the Syrian SANA press agency observed, the ideas expressed in the plan "are contrary to what was achieved at the Geneva conference on national reconciliation and in reality contribute to implementation of the 17 May 1983 agreement between Lebanon and Israel and not its abrogation." At the start of March 1984 the Lebanese Government decided to cancel the said agreement.

The principled position occupied by Syria in connection with the events in Lebanon is causing unconcealed rage in Washington. After all, it is this position which has precluded the possibility of the realization of a "second Camp David"--an Israeli-Lebanese separate agreement, which had been carefully prepared by Washington and Tel Aviv. This is why in recent months the United States has been engaged in open aggressive operations against Syria. Attacks by American aircraft on Syrian forces' positions in Lebanon have been followed by the concentrated shelling of Syrian positions from the guns of the battleship "New Jersey". In the political plane American diplomacy has initiated an assertive campaign aimed at discrediting Syria and attempting to isolate it in the Arab world. Emissaries of the White House, including Secretary of State G. Shultz, are sparing no effort, endeavoring to counterpose the so-called "moderate" Arab states to Syria. But, despite all Washington's tricks, it has not succeeded in shaking Syria's resistance and weakening its alliance with Lebanon's national-patriotic forces.

The just struggle of the Lebanese, Palestinian and other Arab peoples is fully understood and supported by the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union. This was confirmed once again during the meeting on 13 January in the CPSU Central Committee with a delegation of the Lebanese Progressive Socialist Party headed by its chairman W. Jumblatt. B.N. Ponomarev, candidate of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and K.N. Brutents, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, participated in the meeting on the Soviet side. The representatives of the CPSU expressed solidarity with the Lebanese patriots defending their people's right to free and independent development. They confirmed the consistent Soviet position of support for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The participants in the meeting condemned the aggressive policy of the United States in respect of the Arab countries, its threats against Syria and its flagrant interference in Lebanese affairs. They emphatically supported the immediate and unconditional

withdrawal from Lebanese territory of the forces of Israel and NATO countries. Both sides emphasized that "this is an essential prerequisite of a just and lasting intra-Lebanese settlement and the development of the Lebanese Republic as a single, sovereign and democratic Arab state."

On 18 January K.U. Chernenko, B.N. Ponomarev and K.N. Brutents received in the CPSU Central Committee a delegation of the Communist Party of Israel headed by M. Vilner, general secretary of the Communist Party of Israel Central Committee. In the course of the meeting the sides condemned the policy being pursued by the United States and Israel of imposing separate deals on the Arab states, which impede the achievement of an all-embracing settlement and exacerbate the situation in the Near East. They again declared that the Near East conflict may be resolved only by collective efforts, by way of the convening of an international conference with the participation of the USSR, the United States and all interested parties, including the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people.

The situation in the Near East was the subject of discussion at the fourth meeting of heads of state and government of countries which are a part of the Islamic Conference organization, which was held in Casablanca (Morocco) from 16 through 19 January. In the adopted documents the participants in the meeting emphatically condemned Israel's expansionist policy and the so-called American-Israeli "strategic cooperation," which is prompting Tel Aviv to continue the aggression in respect of the Arab states. The leaders of the Muslim countries declared their support for the plan drawn up in Fez for the establishment of peace in the Near East and expressed their solidarity with the Arab people of Palestine fighting for realization of their legitimate national rights. The leaders of the Islamic states condemned the continuing Israeli occupation of Arab territory, including East Jerusalem, and the creation of Israeli militarized settlements on the captured territories. The participants in the meeting also expressed serious concern in connection with the continuation of the Iran-Iraq conflict and appealed to both sides for the speediest end to it.

Following lengthy debate, the decision was made under the pressure of conservative Muslim regimes to restore Egypt's membership of this organization, from which it had been expelled for signing the separate peace with Israel in 1979. This decision was sharply condemned by a number of progressive Arab and other Muslim countries. The meeting also approved admittance to the organization of its 45th member--the Sultanate of Brunei--which had gained independence at the start of the year.

In the front ranks of the struggle for the removal of the threat of war and the consolidation of peace on the Asian continent is the Republic of India, whose political authority is growing constantly throughout the world. Since March 1983 this country has been the leader of the nonaligned movement and as of 1 January 1984 it has taken its seat in the Security Council, to which it has been elected for the next 2 years. India intends to coordinate the positions of the group of nonaligned countries on urgent international problems in the Security Council and in the United Nations as a whole. As (V. Nambiar), leader of the Department for the Nonaligned Movement of the Indian Foreign Ministry,

observes, "as chairman of the nonaligned movement, India aspires primarily to maintain continuity of the policy which has justified itself since the Havana conference on such questions as preventing war, disarmament and the struggle for a new international economic order."

The country's consistent peace-loving policy, which has earned high authority among the world's progressive forces, is reflected in all the political steps taken by Delhi in the international arena. It is for this reason that imperialism and all world reaction are stepping up hostile actions against the republic. As Prime Minister I. Gandhi declared in an interview with the weekly BLITZ, this is being expressed, inter alia, in the creation on the periphery of India's borders of "a ring of hostile states." The fact that a sharp outburst of anti-Indian hysteria in Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh was observed after U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger's visit to a number of states neighboring India was evidently not fortuitous. As Western military specialists observe, Pakistan is already in fact integrated in the global system of Washington's outposts, while Indian Defense Minister R. Venkataraman has called this country a "forward strong point" of the United States in Asia. Recently Washington has been displaying increasingly great interest in the port of Chittagong in Bangladesh, Trincomalee Bay in Sri Lanka and a number of ports in Pakistan. They are all in direct proximity to India's borders.

The situation in the northwest states of Punjab and Haryana became sharply exacerbated in mid-February. Religious-communal clashes flared up. The armed struggle between the Hindu and Sikh communities, to which the majority of the population of these states belongs, led to human casualties and serious material loss. As is known, in recent years separatist groupings supported by foreign reaction have been struggling for the separation of the areas populated predominantly by Sikhs from India and the creation there of so-called Halistan--a religious Sikh state. Armed terrorist groups are operating in Punjab which are carrying out provocative killings and sabotage, robbing banks, hijacking aircraft and intimidating the population. According to a report of the Indian press, some of these groups are being trained and supplied with weapons in Pakistan and have connections with CIA agents. The Sikh Alkali Dal Party, which was defeated at the state assembly elections in 1980, has, in particular, engaged a stormy antigovernment activity. On I. Gandhi's initiative a tripartite conference was convened in Delhi on 14 February on the Punjab's problems with the participation of government ministers, an Alkali Dal delegation and representatives of the opposition parties. However, the armed clashes in Punjab and Haryana which erupted on this day forced the postponement of the conference. Many Indian newspapers express the assumption that in a number of cases the bloody incidents were deliberately provoked to frustrate the conference.

The facts show convincingly that the discord between neighboring states and the religious-communal strife in India are being deliberately supported and exaggerated by internal and foreign reaction to undermine the country's national unity, destabilize the situation and force the government to turn aside from the peace-loving anti-imperialist policy.

The eighth session of the intergovernmental Soviet-Indian commission for economic and scientific-technical cooperation, which charted the arterial directions of the two countries' practical interaction for the years ahead, was held 6-9 December in Delhi. A protocol on commodity exchange for 1984 and a program of scientific-technical cooperation in the period 1984-1987 were signed. An understanding was reached on an extension of production cooperation between Soviet enterprises and engineering plants built with the USSR's assistance in Ranchi, Durgapur and Hardwar. Questions of possible cooperation in the installation in India of a number of new facilities in the sphere of power engineering and ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy; the directions and forms of development of relations in oil and coal industry; and the course of the preparation of the basic directions of economic, commercial and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and India after 1990 were also examined.

Receiving at the start of February a Soviet delegation which had arrived in Delhi to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the commissioning of the foundry in Bhilai, which had been built with the USSR's assistance, Indian President Z. Singh made a high evaluation of the assistance given his country by the Soviet Union in the establishment and development of industry. Thanks to this assistance and support, India maintains its economic independence. India sees the Soviet Union, he emphasized, as its most reliable and sincere friend.

On 7 January the people of much-suffering Kampuchea commemorated the fifth anniversary of the removal of the hated Pol Pot regime and the installation of people's power. As the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers greetings telegram to Heng Samrin and Chan Si, leaders of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, observed, "in the last 5 years the Kampuchean people under the leadership of their combat vanguard--the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea--and relying on the support of the socialist community countries and the world's progressive forces, have overcome numerous difficulties and scored considerable successes on the way to building a new life."

In the sphere of economic building the party has adopted a policy primarily of an upsurge of agriculture. The main result of the party's policy here is the fact that it has succeeded not only in eliminating starvation but also within certain limits of solving the food problem as a whole. This has contributed to a considerable extent to the stabilization of life in the country and strengthened people's belief in the success of the revolution. In the sphere of industrial development the state supports a combination of state and private initiative and it is stimulating primarily the production of goods in everyday use.

Considerable successes have been scored by public education. All forms of tuition in the country are encompassing 1.6 million persons. Of the more than 1 million illiterates which the country had, approximately 600,000 have now been taught to read and write. A considerable number of Kampuchean students are being taught in the socialist countries, approximately 1,500 of whom in the Soviet Union.

Currently the people's efforts are concentrated in three main areas: the further expansion of agricultural production in order to achieve an annual rice harvest of 2.5 million tons; the development of industrial and handicrafts production with the task of exceeding the level reached in 1983 in these sectors by a factor of 2-3; and an improvement in managerial work in the sphere of distribution and exchange, which is a most important aspect of the stabilization of life and production.

People's Kampuchea is making its contribution to the struggle for the consolidation of peace and international security. Together with the fraternal Indochina countries of Vietnam and Laos it advocates a normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia and the establishment of good-neighborly relations between all states of the region.

The eighth conference of foreign ministers of the three Indochina countries--Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea--was held 28-29 January 1984 in Vientiane. Its participants discussed the situation which had come about in the region and noted that it was essential to formulate a common approach to the settlement of Southeast Asia's problems based on equality and respect for the legitimate interests of each of the two groups of countries: countries--ASEAN and Indochina--without the foisting of decisions on one another and without outside pressure. "The three Indochina countries," the conference communique says, "are prepared for bilateral consultations and a dialogue between the two groups of countries: ASEAN and Indochina. All the proposals submitted by each side will be a topic of discussion on the basis of the principle of equality. The People's Republic of Kampuchea confirms its good will, not wishing the question of its participation to impede the start of a dialogue between the two groups of countries. The conferees resolved to choose Laos and Vietnam as representatives of the three Indochina countries for participation in negotiations between the two groups of countries." The participants in the meeting confirmed their readiness for any form of dialogue to discuss the problems which exist between the two groups of countries. The conference demonstrated the sincere aspiration of the Indochina countries to peace and good relations with their neighbors.

The last winter on the African continent was also marked by complex political events. The South African military considerably expanded the aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. The large-scale invasion by Pretoria's troops of the territory of this country was of the nature of open war against the Angolan people. Motorized infantry brigades, artillery and paratroop units and over 100 aircraft and helicopters invaded deep into Angolan territory, wiping out the peaceful civilian population and carrying out scorched earth tactics. Attempting to justify these barbaric actions, Pretoria referred, as before, to the far-fetched pretext of the alleged presence in Angola of Namibian guerrillas from SWAPO. However, the strikes by the racist military were against industrial centers and population centers of Angola hundreds of kilometers from the Namibian border.

To drag out a solution of the question of the granting of independence to Namibia the Pretoria authorities are "linking" it with the presence in Angola of a contingent of Cuban internationalists, who, as is known, are in Angola

at the request of the Angolan Government. They are assisting the young republic in training the Angolan people's armed forces and helping defend the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Angola, which is being subjected to attacks and open aggression on the part of South Africa and mercenaries from the UNITA bandit formations.

Behind all these subversive operations against Angola is international imperialism, primarily the U.S. Administration. The existence of a conspiracy between Washington and Pretoria is easily confirmed by the fact that in December and January the United States declined to vote in the Security Council for a resolution condemning South Africa and demanding the withdrawal of its forces from Angolan territory. Upon a second examination of this question the United States declared that it would not veto the resolution only if the clause concerning sanctions against South Africa were deleted from it. It is precisely such sanctions which the UN Charter envisages in such cases.

In their struggle against the aggression of South Africa and the intrigues of imperialism and reaction the Angolan people rely on the progressive forces of the whole world, primarily the multifaceted assistance and support of the Soviet Union. As O. Troyanovskiy, permanent USSR representative at the United Nations, observed, the USSR emphatically condemns South Africa's aggressive policy in respect of Angola. He emphasized that the USSR, which is linked to Angola by the Friendship and Cooperation Treaty, has given and will continue to give it all possible support in defense of sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

The bloody internecine war in Chad has been continuing for almost two decades. At the start of January, thanks to the vigorous efforts of M.H. Mariam, chairman of the OAU and leader of Ethiopia, a meeting of all military-political groupings of Chad was convened in Addis Ababa. Unfortunately, the attempt to bring the fratricidal war to an end was unsuccessful owing to the obstructionist position occupied by the representatives of the authorities in Ndjamena. The head of the regime, H. Habre, did not go to the Ethiopian capital at all, while the delegation which he sent, putting forward one procedural demand after another, endeavored to lead the meeting away from discussion of the essence of the issues. As the delegation of the Transitional Government of National Unity (TGNU) rightly observed, "the absence in Addis Ababa of Hissene Habre was eloquent testimony to his subordination to the diktat of the foreign masters who are interfering in Chad's internal affairs with impunity, proceeding from their own egotistic interests, and putting obstacles in the way of Chadians' national reconciliation."

The frustration of the meeting within the OAU framework was used as a pretext for the expansion of French military intervention. In August 1983 some 3,000 French paratroops together with 2,000 Zaïrean soldiers and mercenaries saved the Habre regime from defeat. Two factors brought about the French intervention in Chad: the endeavor to strengthen France's own neocolonialist presence in its former colony and the pressure of Washington, which aspired to consolidate NATO's positions in Central Africa. At the end of January

the French forces extended their occupation zone. At the orders of C. Hernu, minister of national defense of France, they advanced more than 100 kilometers north and captured a line running along the 16th parallel.

Commenting on French forces' invasion of the northern regions of the country, T. Gadengo, TGNU secretary of state for foreign affairs, declared that France's actions were an outright declaration of war on the Chadian people. It is a question of aggression confirming France's intention of increasing military operations against the TGNU forces, he emphasized. Opposing the expansion of French military intervention in the affairs of Chad, the newspaper L'HUMANITE observed that "the number of demonstrations in support of negotiations on Chad under the control of the OAU and against the interference of France and other countries in Chad's internal affairs, which only the OAU has a right to examine, is growing in Africa."

The political situation in Central America, where the threat of Washington's open armed interference in the affairs of Nicaragua and El Salvador has increased, remained extraordinarily dangerous last winter. Washington has cobbled together, trained and armed bands of terrorists carrying out raids and acts of sabotage against Nicaragua from the territory of neighboring Honduras. Air raids on the town of Mansanillo and the port of Potosi were carried out from there on 2 and 3 February. There are dead and wounded as a result of the piratical attacks. Lines of communication were damaged and fuel dumps destroyed.

D. Ortega, coordinator of the Directorate of Nicaragua's Government of National Reconstruction, placed the entire responsibility for these aggressive actions on the United States. Speaking at a press conference in Caracas, he noted that "the order for the attacks could have been given only by the United States. The Honduran Army would not have dared carry them out without the appropriate orders." These raids were regarded by political observers as a rehearsal for aggression against Nicaragua. A possible scenario of the development of events is simple. A conflict provoked by Washington between Nicaragua and Honduras is to be the pretext for the direct military intervention of the United States, which would hasten to "assist" Honduras, which has allegedly become a "victim of Nicaraguan aggression".

The White House long since adopted a policy of turning Honduras into an outpost in the struggle against the liberation movement in Latin America and a base for aggressive operations against Nicaragua and interference in the affairs of El Salvador. As became known to AFP, the U.S. Southern Command, which is stationed in Panama, is prepared to adopt measures to "settle the Nicaragua problem militarily." Honduras, a country which, in the words of Gen P. Gorman, commander of this military district, is regarded as a "springboard for operations against Nicaragua and Cuba," could serve as an ideal base for an invasion of Nicaragua.

The Pentagon has embarked on the construction on Honduran territory of a further five aircraft runways. A regional military training center is operating in Puerto Castilla, which will shortly become a military base. Communications systems, with the use of artificial satellites included, are being set up. In the very heart of Central America the Pentagon is developing a springboard for aggressive actions in the region.

As D. Ortega emphasized, the country's patriots, while strengthening their defense, do not intend to succumb to provocations and are continuing to seek peaceful solutions of the problem. General elections, in the course of which a president, vice president and deputies of a national assembly will be elected, were announced for 4 November at a meeting on 21 February in Managua devoted to the memory of the country's national hero, Gen A. Sandino, who died 50 years ago at the hands of the Somocistas. The right to take part in these elections will be granted all legal political parties, opposition parties included. The country's leaders intend to continue the process of strengthening revolutionary democracy begun after the ouster of Somoza.

Considerable successes were scored last winter by the patriots of El Salvador. On the eve of the new year detachments of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front began a successful offensive against government forces. On 31 December they captured and held on to for some time the fort of El Paraiso (situated on several heights and surrounded by a special defense zone), which had been built in accordance with a Washington plan in 1981 and which was considered impregnable. In the course of the battles for this fort approximately 300 soldiers and officers of the government forces were killed or wounded and approximately 200 were taken prisoner. "The defeat at El Paraiso was the most devastating for the government army in the 4 years of war against the guerrillas," a UPI correspondent was forced to acknowledge.

The farce of elections, which it is planned to hold at the end of March, was begun in El Salvador for camouflage. It is proposed staging the performance in accordance with all the rules of bourgeois democracy. Right and ultraright parties are to compete between themselves, "criticizing" each other. The Salvadoran National Liberation Front (FNL) and the Revolutionary-Democratic Front (RDF) have refused to take part in this comedy.

An FNL and RDF document was distributed in Mexico City on 9 February which contains proposals for the creation of a provisional government of El Salvador based on broad representation. The document says, inter alia: "The escalation of the Reagan administration's interference in El Salvador is dragging out the war there and threatening to involve other states of the region in the conflict. We are convinced that the cohesion of the majority of political and social forces, which will be able to solve the problem, having ousted the ruling regime and removed foreign interference, is essential for the achievement of peace in our country." The progressive organizations' proposals provide for the formation of a provisional government, in which "all forces now advocating the ouster of the regime of the oligarchy, the establishment of sovereignty and national independence and that private ownership and foreign investments not be in opposition to the public interest will be represented."

The document provides for the implementation of a number of urgent measures, including cancellation of the current 1983 constitution, the state of siege and laws infringing personal and social liberties, the release of all political prisoners, complete guarantee of rights and democratic liberties, the disbandment of the security corps, "death squads" and their political organization--the National Republican Alliance party--the withdrawal of American advisers, a purge of the armed forces and also a wide range of socioeconomic reforms.

For the realization of these proposals, their authors believe, it is necessary to start negotiations in which the FNL and RDF should participate on the one hand and representatives of the government, the armed forces and the United States on the other. Furthermore, with the consent of the parties, mediators and also representatives of international forums such as, for example, the Contadora Group, should participate in the negotiations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

WESTERN SOCIOLOGISTS' OPTIMISM ON 'INFORMATION SOCIETY' CRITICIZED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian Number 4, April 1984 carries on pages 106-114 a 6,200-word Yu. Nikulichev article entitled "Cul-de-sacs of the 'Information Society'" which portrays the West's vision of the postindustrial or information revolution as an unrealistic means to overcoming society's economic and social "contradictions." The move from an industrial to an information society is covered through an examination of Western journal articles on the growing role of "postindustrial services;" selected articles by D. Bell, A. Toffler, R. Breitenstein, M. Porat, and J. Martin are assessed for their perspectives on developing a "new social structure." The author concludes that overly optimistic projections of one branch of employment to another, due to greater professional specialization and the disappearance of 'old' professions, or the need for greater government financing of social services to support displaced workers. "Promising heaven in the 'technicist', 'electronic', information' and other societies, they in point of fact propose that the masses make peace with existing reality in the name of a very problematic idealistic future."

CSO: 1816/8b-P

BOOK ON DEVELOPMENT OF WORKER CONTROL OVER PRODUCTION

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 141-143

[Yu. Borko review: "Important Direction of the Class Struggle of the Proletariat"]

[Text] The social elevation of the proletariat, which, as V.I. Lenin pointed out, represents a natural result of the development of the antagonism between labor and capital, is manifested in the most diverse forms. One such manifestation is the expansion of the range of the working class' socioeconomic struggle in the capitalist countries and the advancement by its organizations of a number of demands questioning capital's arrogated right to dispose of economic and political power in monopoly fashion. Among them is the slogan of the working people's equal participation in the control of the economy and the establishment of worker control over production.

The author of the monograph in question,* V.A. Vinogradov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, has set himself the task of analyzing from the first steps right through our day the development of the proletariat's struggle for worker control over production. It is the first time that such a study has been undertaken in our country, and this determines both its value and its complexity.

The book consistently examines the struggle of the Russian proletariat for worker control in the pre-October period and the practical implementation of this demand following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution (chapters 1 and 2); the struggle of the proletariat of the European capitalist countries for worker control over production in the years of revolutionary upsurge of 1918-1923 and in the subsequent interwar years (chapter 3); realization of the idea of worker control in the people's democracy countries (chapter 4); and the movement of the working people of West European states for control over production in the postwar decades (chapters 5, 6 and 7). Such a broad chronological and spatial framework has enabled the author to illustrate

* V.A. Vinogradov, "Rabochiy kontrol nad proizvodstvom: teoriya, istoriya, sovremennost'" [Worker Control Over Production: Theory, History, Present Day], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1983, 415 pages.

with great fullness all three aspects of the problem in question denoted in the book's title: theory, history and present day.

The monograph carefully traces the long and far from simple path of quests by West European communist parties and class trade unions for the creative application of a Marxist-Leninist approach to the problem of worker control with regard for national specifics and the changing historical conditions of the class struggle. The section devoted to the years of revolutionary upsurge in the European capitalist countries and the period 1924-1939, which is reflected very scantily in postwar Soviet literature, is of great interest in this respect.

The author recalls that the experience of the international workers movement of the 1920's and 1930's, which was critically examined and collated at the Seventh Comintern Congress, was not in vain: "it was used by the working class under the conditions of the new upsurge of the worker and democratic movement which began after the rout of fascism and the end of World War II" (p 215).

A synthesis of such experience was the demand for democratic control over production put forward in the postwar period by the revolutionary organizations of the working class as an integral part of their antimonopoly programs. The book comprehensively examines the objective factors which contributed to the stimulation of the movement for democratic control over production in the 1950's-1970's. The researcher notes that a demand for the working people's equal participation in the elaboration of economic and social policy and control of its implementation is a part of the program documents of practically all parties of the working class and all trade union centers, irrespective of their ideological-political orientation. At the same time there are profound differences between organizations of the working people's participation in the control of production and also in an evaluation of this specific form or the other of such participation. Together with the revolutionary platform of democratic control over production the reformist concepts of "economic democracy," "worker coparticipation in enterprise management," "socialization" of the means of production by means of converting part of the wage into company shares and so forth are widespread in the workers movement of the said countries.

Characterizing the consistently class-based interpretation of the "democratic control over production" formula, the author adduces the pronouncements of prominent figures of the communist movement in West Europe and quotes the decisions of congresses and program documents of the communist parties of France, the FRG, Portugal, Austria, Great Britain and other countries, which emphasize the important role of the movement for democratic control as an integral part of the struggle against the policy of state-monopoly capitalism. This slogan, the monograph observes, reflects "the endeavor to extend the influence of the working class to the spheres which hitherto have been within the competence only of the employers themselves and the endeavor via intervention in management and participation in decision-making and control over the implementation of these decisions at enterprises and in the economy as a whole to limit the power of the monopolies to dispose of the means of

production, capital investments, prices and profit" (p 407). In developing the struggle for democratic control the communist parties constantly recall that this task may be accomplished in full only on the basis of the transfer of all power to the working people and the liquidation of big capitalist ownership.

In bourgeois literature and also in reformist organizations of the working class the problem of democratization of the economy is frequently narrowed to a question of the working people's participation in a variety of representative bodies involved in production control. As a counterweight to this viewpoint, V. Vinogradov emphasizes that the movement for democratic control is also realized in means of influencing the policy of monopolies and governments which have been tested many times over (strikes and other mass actions of the working people themselves, collective bargaining systems, the parliamentary struggle of workers parties and so forth) and in forms which earlier were in an embryonic state or did not exist at all (institutions of worker representation at enterprises and the participation of trade unions in various regional and national bodies created by the state for the purpose of regulating the economy). The book analyzes in detail the practice of the use of both traditional and new methods of struggle.

The question of the working people's representation in bodies making decisions in economic and social spheres or involved in their preparation has assumed particular seriousness in the European capitalist countries. A continuous struggle around this issue is under way between labor and capital and between bourgeois and workers parties. The polemic within the workers movement is incessant also. The book reveals the causes of both. One is rooted in the persistent attempts of the ruling class to use the representative bodies to integrate the workers movement in the system of state-monopoly capitalism, a second is the limited nature of the functions and possibilities of these bodies and a third is the differing approach of the organizations of the working class to the tasks of these bodies and their activity in them. There is an undoubted danger of the representative bodies being turned into an instrument of "social partnership," nonetheless, it cannot serve as an argument against their use by the working people. Marxist-Leninist parties emphasize in this connection that the movement for democratic control over production should correspond to the fundamental goals and principles of the class struggle.

A big place is devoted in the book to an analysis of the positions of reformist organizations, primarily the trade union centers of West European countries. The author justifiably links the changes in their attitude toward the struggle for participation in production control with the general evolution of the trade union movement in West Europe, primarily with the trend toward the broadening of the tasks and the framework of the activity of the trade unions, which has exposed the groundlessness of the theory and practice of "professional trade unionism" and anarcho- or Christian syndicalism. Both the process of a turn to the left in the reformist trade unions and the sharply strengthened trend toward unity of action of the working people have operated in this same direction.

Under the influence of these general changes, the monograph emphasizes, there is a growing understanding in the reformist trade union movement of the inevitability of the transition from "struggle for distribution of the derived social product between labor and capital to the struggle to participate in economic decision-making and the elaboration of economic and social policy at all levels--from the enterprise through the national economy--in short, to the struggle for democratic control over production" (p 283). Of course, this has not removed profound differences between the consistently class-based and reformist understandings of the content and ultimate goals of the struggle for democratic control. However, there is a rapprochement of practical positions and also a number of program demands in this sphere, and this has created more favorable opportunities for the further development of the unity of action of the working class and its increased influence on the socioeconomic policy of the monopolies and the state.

As the author shows, the experience of the struggle for democratic control over production accumulated by the workers movement of the European capitalist countries in the past three decades is far from synonymous: it has, figuratively speaking, both light and shade. But as a whole, the work emphasizes, practice has answered in the affirmative the main question--concerning the need for the use of all forms of struggle both for the more effective defense of the working people's day-to-day interests and for preparation of the conditions for a fundamental transformation of social relations.

A few words about questions which have not been sufficiently illustrated. One of them concerns the interconnection of traditional forms of class struggle with the movement for democratic control. The sections devoted to individual countries adduce considerable factual material corroborating the justification of the author's proposition that the said interconnection is strengthening. Nonetheless, it would by no means have been superfluous for the book to have had, say, a section containing a summary description of the evolution of the strike movement and collective bargaining system, thanks to which these forms of class struggle have become organically interwoven with the struggle for the working people's participation in production control.

Another question which awaits additional research is non-Marxist theories of democratization of the economy. The author makes a fundamental class evaluation of some of them, mainly reformist concepts of social democracy and of the trade unions which follow it. However, a comprehensive critical analysis of such doctrines and, even more, of bourgeois scholars' views on the problem in question has remained outside of the framework of the study.

As a whole, however, V. Vinogradov's monograph is a thorough, interesting work which illustrates with great fullness the development of the revolutionary theory and practice of the struggle of the working class of the capitalist states for democratic control over production over a long historical period. It undoubtedly advances the study of problems of the international workers movement.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

ROLE OF PERSIAN GULF OIL IN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4,
Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 143-145

[A. El'yanov review: "Oil--Economy--Policy"]

[Text] Dozens and hundreds of the most diverse publications are devoted to the role of oil in the economy and policy of the modern world. Particularly close attention is attracted by questions connected with Near East oil, which accounts for approximately two-thirds of assayed reserves of this most valuable raw material and fuel outside of the socialist world. Nonetheless, it is difficult to overlook A. Primakov's book,* which is very modest in size, but highly trenchant, which appeared recently. Leafing through this book, one feels particularly the loss sustained by our science in connection with the untimely departure from life of the author, who had not even reached the age of 28. And although the book in question is essentially the first test of his pen, it may serve as an example of a bold, creative approach to a study of the most burning problems of our time.

The author's attention is concentrated on a study of three key questions: the crisis of the imperialist system of exploitation of Near East oil; rent and price-forming in the Near East's oil industry; and relations among the oil-exporting countries, the oil monopolies and the imperialist states following nationalization. As you would imagine, the radical changes which have occurred in the past 10-15 years in the mechanism of exploitation of Near East oil and their influence on the socioeconomic evolution of the Persian Gulf countries and these countries' place in current international economic relations and also on the development of the oil market and the world capitalist economy as a whole are connected with these problems to a decisive extent.

Developing the first of the three subjects chosen for study, A. Primakov scrupulously traces on the basis of a vast amount of factual material the main stages and forms of the Persian Gulf countries' offensive against the positions of foreign capital in the oil industry and of the interconnection of this

* A.Ye. Primakov, "Persidskiy zaliv: neft' i monopolii" [The Persian Gulf: Oil and the Monopolies] (Exec. ed. I.D. Ivanov), Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Mysl'", 1983, 160 pages.

offensive with the development of the national liberation movement as a whole and the oil-exporting states' active use of interimperialist conflicts in the struggle to restore national sovereignty over their principal natural resource.

As the book convincingly shows, a considerable role in their liberation from the stifling embraces of the "oil octopus" was performed by strategy and tactics of the struggle for their legitimate interests whereby the success of this country or the other on the oil front in time inevitably became the property of all the other oil-exporting states, and not only in the Near East, furthermore (p 43-48). The chain was broken, as a rule, primarily by those which pursued "the most consistent anti-imperialist policy" (p 42). But the logic of the struggle and the pressure of public opinion prompted the following of the same course even by states whose ruling circles are supporters of a "moderate," even conservative policy in relations with imperialism.

I believe that largely thanks to this course of events, the neocolonial system of the exploitation of the Near East countries, which came to replace colonial-type concession relations, has not yet managed essentially to establish itself and has found itself in a state of profound crisis, whose main manifestation the author rightly discerns in the ending of the imperialist monopolies' control over the price-forming process on the world oil market (p 49). As a result there has been a profound transformation of the entire system of the cost relations which take shape in connection with the exploitation of the Near East countries' oil resources, the formation of world prices for oil and the distribution of the revenues which it provides.

Taking the Marxist theory of rent as a basis, A. Primakov has boldly undertaken a study of an extraordinarily complex and multifaceted problem and has, in general, handled it highly successfully. While paying tribute to the author's numerous successes--of both an individual and general nature--that is, we believe, undoubtedly among the most significant; he has demonstrated a profound content analysis not only of economic and political economy questions proper but also of "purely" political questions.

The analysis is conducted in accordance with three main directions. First, the specifics of price-forming for limited resources are examined at the theoretical level, then there is a study of the current oil price and rent and in conclusion the new situation in the oil market which had taken shape at the start of the 1980's is described. While enlisting a wealth of factual material, the author has, however, refrained from the temptation to attempt to determine the quantitative parameters of the material basis of rent and its components in the price of Near East oil. And correctly so. Considering the multilevel nature and varying scale of the huge number of factors of a general economic, situational and political nature under whose influence the general level of world oil prices and rent itself is formed, such an attempt could hardly have been successful. Nonetheless, he has managed to provide the entire necessary source material for inferences on this question.

In particular, it is clear from the research that has been done that absolute rent in the Near East's oil-producing industry has grown into monopoly rent, the limit of which is conditioned, in K. Marx's words, merely by "demand and the solvency of the purchasers" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 25, Part II, p 324.). And grown, furthermore, not only and, rather, not so much even as a result of the increase in the organic composition of capital in the said sector but as a consequence of the repeated increases in world oil prices. The latter, having changed the general price proportions in the world capitalist economy, have led to a tangible redistribution in favor of the oil-producing countries of the product being created there.

The forecast of the general conditions of the market and the probable dynamics of oil prices in the 1980's made in the work in connection with the analysis of the changes in the system of price-forming is also of independent significance. The author has actually had to make a multifactor analysis here, whose main results have essentially already been corroborated by the actual course of events, although the period embraced by the forecast is far from over.

The analysis of the relations which took shape following nationalization in the oil-exporting countries--oil monopolies--imperialist states triangle with which the monograph closes is also of considerable interest. And it is not even a question only of a highly fruitful attempt to provide a forecast of these relations for the foreseeable future or of a portrayal of a certain nonconcurrence of the private interests and goals of the oil concerns and the imperialist states reflecting the interests of the entire state-monopoly complex. Although, we would note, both undoubtedly merit the closest attention. In our view, the main attraction of this section, as, incidentally, surely of the entire book also, is that it excites, thought, forcing contemplation once again of the questions broached here. Among them is primarily the problem of the socioeconomic essence of the new forms of the Near East countries' ties to and relations with the oil concerns and the state-monopoly structures of the developed capitalist countries as a whole.

The author rightly notes that owing to the oil-producing countries' lack of experience and technical and sometimes financial opportunities for the independent development and realization of the oil resources following nationalization, they could hardly have been expected to renounce all relations with the oil monopolies. Business contacts with the latter, as the book emphasizes entirely justifiably, "could in principle be used to accelerate economic development and ultimately to strengthen economic independence" (p 103). Such, essentially, is the dialectic of life, which, probably, is taken into consideration not only by progressive but also conservative regimes of the oil-exporting countries if they have joined in the active struggle for a "place in the sun". A failure to understand it is fraught with the danger of serious errors in an evaluation of current, as, equally, possible future, trends in the social life of both groups of these states.

There is a slight hitch merely in the fact that this exceptionally important proposition, like a number of other of the author's propositions also (concerning the profound crisis of the entire neocolonial system of the

exploitation of Near East oil, the conversion of the countries which possess it from voiceless objects into equal subjects of world "oil" policy and the growth of absolute rent into monopoly rent) does not entirely agree with the assertion that the above-mentioned countries are viewed, as before, merely as an object of neocolonialist exploitation on the part of imperialism.

In speaking of this, we do not in the least intend to dispute the very existence of a system of neocolonialism and, even less, its disastrous influence on the fate of the former colonies and semicolonies. But we believe, nonetheless, that now this system no longer encompasses and cannot encompass the entire sum of relations between the developing and developed capitalist states and in the economic plane by no means amounts merely to the latter's exploitation of the former. Moreover, in a number of cases, like, for example, in the relations of the same oil-exporting Near East states with imperialism, such exploitation is hardly the main and, even less, all-encompassing sign of the neocolonialist system which has arisen on the debris of the former colonial-type concessions. Deprived of the opportunity of controlling all phases of price-forming in the oil business, the dominant monopolies in this sphere and the imperialist states importing liquid fuel, as the author observes perfectly correctly, "have been able to pass the increase in the purchase price of oil onto the consumers and not only have not incurred financial losses here but have increased their revenues" (p 121).

This does not mean, of course, that the OPEC countries are now quite unsubjected to exploitation. They undoubtedly are subjected, and, what is more, possibly on an immeasurably greater scale than before. But, possibly, primarily in other, nonoil spheres of the economic life and in other areas of economic relations with imperialism. Together with the main economic results of the struggle of the oil-producing states for the restoration of national sovereignty over the leading sector of their economy, this also reflects the tremendous difficulties which all the developing countries are encountering in the struggle for complete economic decolonization. Such broad generalizations suggest themselves upon contemplation of the undoubtedly very interesting and useful book of A. Primakov, who, unfortunately, will himself not continue the successful research which he has begun.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

LUKIN BOOK ON U.S., EUROPEAN, JAPANESE CHANGES IN INFLUENCE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 147-150

[V. Baranovskiy review: "Important Facet of International Relations"]

[Text] The book in question* would be of undoubted interest even if its content had amounted to a comparative international-political description or summary survey of the foreign policy of global and regional power centers (in the first case it is a question of the United States, the West European countries and Japan, in the second of India, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Israel, Nigeria, South Africa, Brazil and Mexico). However, it sets a broader (and, we would add, more complex) task. It is a question of an attempt to examine the actual and latent potential at the disposal of each of the enumerated states, primarily from the viewpoint of the extent to which it enables them to play the part of active "character" in the world arena. What determines the nature of this part, what are the objectively conditioned limits of the international-political influence of the corresponding states and how are the power-center status or claims thereto reflected in foreign policy behavior--such is the specific, particular angle from which the problems raised in the work are analyzed.

The author ascertains certain important trends of current international-political development outside of the socialist world. It is a question, first, of an objective diminution in the foreign policy potential of the United States; second, of the consolidation of the West European power center and its enhanced role in international relations; and third, of the pronounced foreign policy activation of Japan which has been observed most recently. As far as many regional power centers are concerned, their role in international-political development, V. Lukin believes, as, equally, the scale of actual influence, is often simply impossible to consider conclusively established--the impact of internal political factors and specific circumstances taking shape in the corresponding parts of the world is so palpable here. For example, the general recession in the world capitalist cycle of the start of the 1980's in combination with the change in the oil

* V.P. Lukin, "'Tsentry sily': kontseptsii i real'nost'" ['Power Centers': Conceptions and Reality], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1983, 256 pages.

situation has brought about crisis phenomena in the economy and a general decline in the power-center potential in such highly diverse and far-removed countries as Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Nigeria and Brazil.

Thus the process of activation of this big state or the other in the world arena or within the framework of a regional subsystem of international relations frequently proves uneven and subject to temporary "spurts" and "slumps". Attempting to analyze such changes, Western political scientists frequently switch from one extreme to another. What yesterday even they were prepared to declare the Iraqi, Brazilian, Arab or some other "miracle" (economic, oil, military and so forth) they are today beginning to manifestly underestimate or disregard altogether. "Yet," V. Lukin rightly observes in this connection, "miracles appear where the real patterns of the historical process have not been revealed or understood. A close look at the evolution of any claimant to the role of 'power center' shows that it is subordinate to the basic regularities of the development of the current international-political situation" (pp 237-238).

The foreign policy independence of the claimants to the role of power centers, the book observes, is in a whole number of respects of a limited nature. In order to perform a dynamic, aggressive foreign policy role countries which are or wish to be power centers often have to exert the maximum effort, which is at times beyond their potential. In this soil "even such specific regional gendarmes artificially cultivated by imperialism as South Africa and Israel at times display their own pretensions and ambitions and create certain difficulties and inconveniences for those who with complete justification regard themselves as their guardians and suzerains" (p 237).

But in many instances this is merely an apparent autonomy and an illusory breadth of possibilities of individual-country self-assertion. While the ambitions of aspiring politicians and even whole groups of the ruling class possessing higher-than-usual dynamism or adhering to an expansionist orientation may perform merely a kind of formative function for such foreign policy activism. At deeper and more significant levels powerful inhibitors are revealed restraining a surplus thereof either through the creation of effective incentives for group discipline or through a tangible increase in the price of the sanctions which inevitably follow manifest violations of the "rules of the game" dictated by the evolved objective conditions of international-political development.

This conclusion essentially applies not only to the activity of states which manifest greater-than-usual assertiveness at the regional level but also to the foreign policy of the biggest imperialist power center with indisputable global potential--the United States. As the book in question rightly observes, the American ruling elite is only belatedly recognizing the objective processes which have been occurring in the world since World War II, and for this reason "attempts to adapt to the new reality in a pragmatic spirit are combined with quite lengthy periods of nostalgia for the disappearing past" (p 60). The foreign policy course of the present administration has been developed on the basis of distorted ideas about the surrounding world. The attempts, on the other hand, of people from the White House to "adapt" reality to their ideas of

the world can bring the United States only fruit of dubious quality like the "major military victory over world communism"--the invasion of Grenada. It appears that in the course of the struggle for reelection President R. Reagan will have to present this shameful action as a major U.S. foreign policy "achievement". Any other more significant results of the activity of the administration, which aspires to the restoration of an undoubtedly privileged position of the American power center, with no consideration for anyone or anything, simply do not exist.

Numerous difficulties are also arising in the way of the establishment of the West European power center. The economic integration of a number of states of the region within the EEC framework is not the equivalent of the creation of such a center (p 71), while the acute conflicts between Common Market participants on a broad range of questions--from the budget through agricultural policy--entail serious problems not only in the plane of the internal evolution of the integration association but also from the viewpoint of its international-political influence. However, "if this question is approached from the standpoints of a longer perspective," the book observes, "...the preservation and multiplication of objective trends and subjective motivations operating in a direction leading to the consolidation of the West European 'power center' become obvious (p 98). Less pronounced as yet is the global political role of the third imperialist center--Japan--although the West European, Latin American and Near East directions in its activity are gradually being galvanized; thereby, the author believes, certain elements are beginning to take shape "from which Japan's strategy in future decades may be formed" (p 129).

In a study sustained on the basis of such extensive material not all propositions and arguments are necessarily equally indisputable. And there is no contradiction in the fact that it is this fact which makes the work even more attractive for the specialist and for any thoughtful reader, inviting him to differ, argue and put forward his own explanation of this aspect of the problem or the other.

Thus, for example, the author rightly points to the fact that a struggle of two opposite groupings is usually under way in this form or the other on the question of the general directions of foreign policy orientation in the ruling class of the imperialist powers. If the distinction between them is made in the most general plane, in one case pride of place is given the task of close coordination of the actions of the leading capitalist powers and a certain subordination of single-country ambitions and pretensions to these more general tasks; in the other the emphasis is put on actions which are more unilateral, nationalist and "egotistical" in respect of one's capitalist partners. Such a provisional division appears legitimate, as does, equally, the thought that in the second case, appealing to "traditions of national greatness," the intra-country power potential is usually interpreted more or less arbitrarily. But to consider only a second grouping the "vector of power-center ambitions" (p 16) is, we believe, somewhat one-sided. It may pursue more adventurist goals and its great-power ambitions may be expressed more precisely and candidly, but this does not mean that the other grouping, which is more "concerned" for the defense of the common interests of the imperialist camp,

necessarily ignores the actual existence of different power centers within this camp or necessarily sacrifices the interests of its own country for this purpose.

With reference to the activity of the United States this means that a power-center policy and the doctrine of "interdependence" cannot be counterposed, as the book in question does. After all, in the latter case the reference was primarily to the consolidation of relations between three imperialist centers (and, it must be thought, not in order to weaken them). It is not fortuitous that opponents saw the "interdependence policy" of Carter and Brzezinski merely as an attempt by the American leadership "to restore to itself undisputed leadership in the world both at the expense of its main allies" (p 53). And it is this which is a typical power-center approach.

The monograph has made an interesting attempt to interpret the material that has been studied in the summary, conceptual plane. Having critically analyzed the "bipolar" and "multipolar" world concepts which are widespread in Western literature and the theoretical views of "political realists" and disciples of the "interdependence" doctrine, the authors show their one-sided and at the same time intrinsically contradictory nature, which leads to a distortion of the actual picture of international relations. Power center in contemporary world politics are a complex and contradictory phenomenon representing an essential international-political reality. "Ignoring this reality is just as unwarranted as its absolutization and an endeavor to construct thereon, and only thereon, the entire modern international-political structure" (p 240). The complex dynamics of the mutual relations of the two opposite social systems, the growing anti-imperialist potential of the nonaligned movement, the active role of many medium and small states in world politics, the activity of a variety of global (the United Nations) and regional international organizations--such are the most important factors which have to be taken into consideration first of all upon an analysis of the multifaceted world of present-day international relations. "And the so-called 'power centers' are only one and by no means its sharpest facet. At the same time there is no doubt that without this facet, without this reality the general picture of contemporary world politics would be incomplete and deprived of certain essential nuances" (pp 240-241). It is for this reason that V. Lukin's work, in which the said facet is studied from the viewpoint of Marxist-Leninist methodology, appears topical and significant.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

JPRS-UWE-84-008

11 July 1984

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 4, April 1984

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U. S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

11 July 1984

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 4, April 1984

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal *MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA* published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

English Summaries of Major Articles in MEMO Journal (pp 158-159).....	1
Zagladin on World Crisis, Lenin's Teachings (pp 3-24) (V. Zagladin).....	4
True Values and False Ideals (pp 25-37) (E. Kuz'min) (not translated)	
Limited Nuclear War Concept, U.S. Policy Criticized (pp 38-50) (V. Kortunov).....	32
U.S. 'Gunboat Diplomacy' in Lebanon, Support for Israel (pp 51-63) (O. Kovtunovich, V. Nosenko).....	47
New Features of Monopoly Business (pp 64-70) (Ya. Pevzner) (not translated)	
Employer Groups in Japan (pp 71-81) (H. Okumoura) (not translated)	
INTERNATIONAL ROUNDUP	
Current Problems of World Politics (pp 82-101) (V. Babak, V. Vladimirov, K. Nikolayev).....	61

OUR COMMENTARY

Disagreements Are Growing (pp 102-105)
(T. Kosyрева) (not translated)

SOCIOLOGIST'S OPINION

Western Sociologists' Optimism on 'Information Society' Criticized (pp 106-114)
(Yu. Nikulichev) (editorial report)..... 79

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

Transnational Corporations in the Economy of the Developing World
(p 115-124)
(A. Bereznoy) (not translated)

International Activity of French Banks (pp 125-132)
(G. Vlasov) (not translated)

State Regulation of Power Engineering in Developed Capitalist Countries
(pp 133-140)
(L. Zonova, V. Chernyavina) (not translated)

BOOKS, AUTHORS

Book on Development of Worker Control Over Production (pp 141-143)
(Yu. Borko)..... 90

Role of Persian Gulf Oil in International Economy Reviewed (pp 143-145)
(A. El'yanov)..... 84

Yu. Oleshchuk review of "The State, Class and the Recession" edited
by Steward Clegg, Geoff Dow and Paul Boreham (pp 145-147)
(not translated)

Lukin Book on U.S., European, Japanese Changes in Influence (pp 147-150)
(V. Baranovskiy)..... 88

Books Detailing Problems of ASEAN Reviewed (pp 150-152)
(E. Grebenshchikov)..... 92

R. Leshchiner review of F.L. Bromberg's "Scientific-Technical Progress
and the Development of the Power Engineering of the Main Capitalist
Countries" (pp 152-154) (not translated)

G. Ponedelko, I. Tsapenko review of Sima Liberman's "The Contemporary
Spanish Economy: A Historical Perspective" (pp 154-155) (not translated)

Obituary of Sergey Ivanovich Tyul'panov (p 156) (not translated)

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS No 4, April 1984

Russian title : MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE
OTNOSHENIYA

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : Ya.S. Khavinson

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : April 1984

Signed to press : 16 March 1984

Copies : 29,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya
ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya".
1984.

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES IN MEMO JOURNAL

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4,
Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 158-159

[Text] The article by V. Zagladin "Present-Day International Crisis in the Light of Lenin's Teaching" is concerned with the increasingly tension-ridden international situation, characterized by destabilized international relations and imminent threat of nuclear war. Special attention is paid to the particular danger of confrontation which has spread not only to politics, economy and ideology but also involves the military-political sphere with its monstrous race of weapons. Not only do old hotbeds of conflict exist but new ones appear. The article considers the present-day international crisis to be not an isolated phenomenon. It notes that only the Marxist-Leninist theory and above all Lenin's teaching about imperialism in the present epoch as well as the international relations inherent in it are the key to a comprehension of the situation, providing for an objective and clear class approach. The author points out that an analysis of present-day international crisis assumes not only political and ideological but also theoretical and conceptional importance. Such a study according to the author's opinion makes possible, with due consideration for the new phenomena, a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the principal trends of social development and the development of the two systems in conditions of the growing strength and influence of socialism, strategic parity between socialism and imperialism.

E. Kuz'min in the article "True Values and False Ideals" presents a parallel examination of the socialist and capitalist system and shows how advantageous socialism is over capitalism while providing for the rights and freedoms of man and the interests and aspirations of the working people. The author concentrates on the inner nature of Soviet democracy as a society of social justice and genuine democracy, fundamentally reveals the new quality of life of the working people incorporating the entire spectrum of sanguine human life. The author criticizes such bourgeois concepts as "political pluralism", "Open society" etc, trying to discredit socialist democracy while advertising the bourgeois one. The article convincingly shows that absent in socialism is a social ground, any objective class base for the realization of capitalist "pluralistic models" and explains the incompatibility between genuine democracy and capitalism. It explains why genuine democracy is possible only under socialism as vividly manifested in the activities of the main organ of Soviet democracy--the Soviets of People's Deputies. The expansion and improvement of Soviet statehood are an important area of Soviet society's onward movement the article states.

V. Kortunov's article "Limited Nuclear War as a Strategy of Global Suicide" focuses attention upon the doctrine of "limited nuclear war" popular in the USA at present. It explains why such importance is attached to this concept both on the military-political and propaganda plane by the aggressive circles who have chosen murder and blackmail as a continuous factor of their policy. In his striving to make a fuller study of the problem the author reveals the roots of this conception, its evolution and risky nature. Special stress is laid on the latest applications of the idea most notably reinforced since R. Reagan's rise to power. The article exposes the dangerous nature of the doctrine and its latest elaboration. To the American doctrine of "limited nuclear war" the Soviet Union counterposes its clear-cut stand: Peace must be safeguarded as the apple of the eye and the security of our Motherland ensured. Nuclear war--whether, big or small, whether limited or total must not be allowed to break out.

O. Kovtunovich and V. Nosenko in the article "The Middle East-Imperialist Policy of Strength in Action" focus their attention on the principal trends of American policy in the Middle East in the late 1970's and early 1980's and Washington's tendency to use military methods to reach its foreign-policy aims in the region. The authors trace different stages of the growing use by America of armed forces in the Middle East including the period from the Carter administration's plan to build up "Rapid Deployment Forces" to the Reagan administration's commitment to use the regular U.S. troops in Lebanon. Special stress is laid on the fact that the shifts to be observed in American policy have firstly, contributed to Israeli's blunt escalation of aggression in relation to the neighboring Arab countries and its more rigid approach to the problem of the occupied in the 1967th territories; and secondly have mounted new grave obstacles on the road of a just settlement of the Middle East conflict. The article outlines U.S. and Israeli activities in Lebanon which add to the complexity of the risky situation in the country. The existing situation aggravates tension in the Middle East thus directly menacing world peace.

The "New Features of Monopolistic Entrepreneurship" by Ya. Pevzner provides an extended commentary on Okumoura's study of entrepreneurial groups in Japan, published in the same issue.

The present-day economic theory focuses on new features of the interaction of the bourgeois state and private business. According to the Neoconservative postulates, "supply-side economics" paradigmas in particular, there is flagrant evidence to the fact that state regulation is openly oriented towards more active support of capitalist corporations.

Ya. Pevzner indicates that H. Okumoura managed to discover the essential features of such processes inherent to all industrial capitalist countries taking a very specific example of Japan. To his opinion Japanese economist contributed to the examination of industrial structure of the concentration of capital process, tracing the interpenetration of monopoly and competition.

Beyond Okumoura's study are the problems of the state monopoly regulation, acquiring special importance in course of the ongoing administrative and financial reform in Japan, aimed at fostering the private initiative at

governmental, so to say, expenses. This reform can be regarded as Japanese version of Neoconservative economic prescriptions envisaging the curtailment of state interference in economic matters, leading even to privatisation of state property. This policy would inevitably provoke growth of unemployment and increase of social tension.

H. Okumoura. Japanese economist and scientific consultant of Japanese firms took part in the 15th symposium of Soviet and Japanese economists held in Moscow last year. In this issue we present his report "Enterpreneurial Groups in Japan".

The author dwells upon the main forms of vertical and horizontal integration of Japanese business stressing the particulars of the concentration of capital process in Japan. Taking an in-depth view of the design of centralization of capital within the infra-firm partnerships the author provides a firm empirical foundation for a very important hypothesis that Japanese pattern of business partnership in production of intermediate good comprises sharp competition in marketing of finalised goods.

The corporative economy of Japan, due to its flexibility and comparative efficiency has contributed greatly to the growth of international competitiveness of Japan thus involving adverse effects upon the interimperialist relations. The further evolution of corporativism in Japan would depend heavily on the possibility of a compromise between the pursued course towards political collaboration with the imperialist counterparts and mounting economic conflicts in world capitalist trade, export of capital, transfer of technology. For the corporative design of economy has revealed not only its efficiency in Japan but also certain margins in perspective, this compromise turns up to be an urgent task for the ruling circles in Japan.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

CSO: 1812/173-E

ZAGLADIN ON WORLD CRISIS, LENIN'S TEACHINGS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 3-24

[Vadim Zagladin article: "The Contemporary International Crisis in the Light of Lenin's Teaching"--words in all capitals published in boldface]

[Text]

I

The international situation at the beginning of the eighties is characterized by a high degree of tension. The dangerous exacerbation of this tension has led to a serious destabilization in interstate relations. The threat of the outbreak of a nuclear war has increased.

The external symptoms of the aforementioned processes are well known. The question is primarily one of the exceptional intensification in the confrontation between American imperialism and NATO, and the Soviet Union and socialism in general. What is particularly dangerous is the fact that this confrontation has not just spread to the spheres of politics, the economy, and ideology. The opposition between the two military-political blocs--NATO and the Warsaw Pact--has acquired both new forms and content. This is particularly reflected in the deployment of American first-strike missiles in Western Europe, to which the Soviet Union and its allies have been compelled to respond with corresponding countermeasures.

Further, the question is one of the monstrous arms race, which truly has no analogy in the past. Weapons are not only being amassed at an accelerated rate, but are being fundamentally and qualitatively perfected. Thus, nuclear weapons are becoming more and more accurate and, at the same time, more compact, even miniature, which narrows the prospects of establishing effective control over them. Attempts are being made to introduce these weapons into space, which would create an unprecedented threat for the whole of mankind. The studies in the chemical and bacteriological weapons sphere are being conducted on a vast scale. Conventional-type weapons are beginning to become similar to mass destruction weapons in their characteristics.

The question is also not only one of "old" hotbeds of aggression being preserved, but of new ones arising as well. An example of the former is primarily the Middle East, where Israel's aggression against the Arab people still continues. What is more, the United States has become a direct

participant in the war and a direct military ally of Tel Aviv. The troops of a number of West European countries have also been drawn into military operations in Lebanon.

The threat of the conflict widening is assuming ever more tangible forms. At the same time, the provocations against Angola by the South African racist regime, which enjoys the patronage of the United States and NATO, and interference by imperialist forces in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and Kampuchea, still continue.

A primary example of the "new" hotbeds of aggression is Central America. In the autumn of 1983, Grenada was subjected to aggression which was in no way provoked, and is now occupied by the United States. The undeclared war against Nicaragua by Washington and Central American dictatorial regimes (which are now, at the initiative of the United States, in the process of forming a military bloc) is assuming an ever greater scale. American interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador is underway.

All this rightly troubles people in all four corners of the earth. One can say that world politics has now invaded every home and every family. Professional politicians have obviously now forever lost their "customary" monopoly on discussing and predicting the complex processes developing in the world, which are deeply contradictory in their very essence. These processes have become the object not only of the attention, but also of the actions of the popular masses.

How could it happen that the detente that was reached at the expense of great effort has now been replaced by confrontation and, the main thing; who bears the responsibility for all that has happened and for the growing threat of war? Various answers are given to these questions, and at times they are mutually exclusive. This is understandable: In a world divided into social systems which are mutually opposed in essence, and in a world of the bitterest social clashes, the problems of war and of averting it, including the problem of responsibility for the existing dangerous situation, cannot but be the object of the bitterest class and ideological struggle.

Imperialist propaganda claims that the responsibility for the present tension is supposedly borne by socialism, and primarily by the Soviet Union, which appears as "the focus of evil" and as the source of all mankind's serious problems. This stand is not new--basically, it has existed as long as socialism. However, today it is presented with truly unprecedented bitterness.

The responsibility of the ruling circles in Washington and of its closest allies for the present state of affairs in the world is more and more frequently admitted in liberal-bourgeois circles both in the United States and especially in Western Europe. However, they are inclined to regard the policy of the Soviet Union, which, they say, has "upset" the military balance in Europe, "invaded" Afghanistan, and so forth and so on, as the main cause of tension in this respect.

The point of view according to which the responsibility for the tension rests equally with both sides--both socialism and imperialism, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the USSR and the United States--is current in a certain section of democratic society, including among some detachments of the antiwar movement. This is a manifestation of the typical petty bourgeois approach, the essence of which basically lies in trying to avoid precisely defining one's own place in the all-embracing struggle of two lines and two political courses that has developed in the world arena.

Echoes of this stand have also been noted among the ranks of the communist movement. Thus, some comrades have claimed that the real cause of the tension is supposedly the rivalry of two great powers allegedly pursuing their own hegemonist aims. In other words, the causes of the aggravation of the situation have been reduced to a clash between the USSR's and the U.S.' "superpower interests."

To this it has been frequently added that, quote, in the middle of the seventies, the Soviet Union did not make use of all the available opportunities for strengthening detente, and that it undertook "imprudent" actions which "irritated" imperialism and "forced" it to adopt a course of confrontation.

It is true that these kind of motives have recently been repeated less frequently. Those very same comrades who advanced these motives now emphasize that responsibility for the present state of affairs rests "primarily" with imperialism (let us note that the word "primarily" remains). And the number of advocates of the thesis of the "equal responsibility" of socialism and capitalism for the exacerbation of the international situation has been reduced to a certain extent within the antiwar movement. This is completely natural. With every passing day, socialism's foreign policy provides even more convincing evidence of the genuine peacefulness of the USSR and its allies. At the same time, the U.S. policy convinces even many diehards of the fact that the real guilty party responsible for the growth of tension is precisely Washington.

Everyone who is really striving to preserve peace is called upon to most actively participate in the struggle for the truth and for the right answer to the question about the real state of affairs within the present international crisis.

Only Marxist-Leninist theory, and primarily the Leninist teaching about imperialism and the contemporary era and the international relations characteristic of it, can provide the sole correct and scientific answer to this question, an answer that provides a reliable key to understanding the existing situation by ensuring objectivity and a clear class approach.

It should be taken into account that an analysis of the present international crisis has not only political and ideological, but also theoretical and world outlook significance. In our opinion, this kind of research makes it possible to continue, while taking new phenomena into account, the Marxist-Leninist study of the main trends of social development and of the development of two systems in the conditions of the growth of socialism's force and influence and its achievement of military-strategic parity with imperialism.

The present international crisis is not an isolated phenomenon. As is well-known, international relations, according to K. Marx' definition, pertain to the category of "secondary and tertiary," generally "derived," "transferred," and "non-primary production relations."¹ Naturally, in the final analysis, their development reflects the nature of the development of production relations in the contemporary world.

The main specific feature of our era, which was opened by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is the coexistence, to use the words of V.I. Lenin, of two systems of ownership, or two social systems. International relations in the contemporary era are correspondingly based not on some unified system of production relations, but on two such systems--socialist and capitalist--each of which develops according to its own laws. Consequently, these relations reflect, first, the general dynamics of the development of productive forces and production relations in the socialist world; second, the corresponding dynamism in the capitalist world; and third, the interaction of socialism and capitalism, and the nature and particular features of the relations between them at each given stage of historical development.

The core of international relations and the main direction of their development after the Great October Socialist Revolution was the struggle between the two opposite world systems, socialism and capitalism. V.I. Lenin was the first to call attention to this circumstance.

"...The mutual relations between peoples and the entire world system of states are determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia,"² V.I. Lenin said in 1920. In this connection, he attached the foremost importance for opening up the mutual relations between the two systems to the correlation of forces on the world scene. V.I. Lenin saw the prerequisite for working out a correct political line in a sober and strictly objective consideration of "ALL class forces of any given state (as well as of the state surrounding it, and of all states on a worldwide scale)."³ For this reason, the leader of the October Revolution devoted his tireless attention to the problem of comprehensively strengthening the position of socialism and of consolidating the international position of history's first socialist state. "The international position," he said, "...turns around the struggle of Soviet Russia with others, that is, the capitalist states. Strengthening Soviet Russia and making it invincible--this is the main thing...."⁴

In analyzing V.I. Lenin's precepts on the ways of strengthening the positions of socialism in its antagonism with capitalism on the world scene, it is impossible not to notice that he did not call attention to only one factor of some kind, but to the entire totality of various factors. They are primarily the following:

The need for fully realizing the potentials of the socialist system that opens the prospects for the society's unlimited progress;

A successful economic construction. "The struggle has been transferred to this sphere on a worldwide scale," V.I. Lenin said in 1921. "If we fulfill this task, then we will probably win definitely and finally on the worldwide scale as well. For this reason, the questions of economic construction have for us an absolutely extraordinary importance."⁵

Strengthening the military might of socialism for the defense of its achievements. "We could not exist without an armed protection of the socialist republic,"⁶ V.I. Lenin wrote. "...Whoever forgets the danger that constantly threatens us and that will not end as long as world imperialism exists, whoever forgets that also forgets our workers' republic."⁷

Foreign political activeness of socialism both in the sphere of pursuing the course of peaceful coexistence and developing economic relations with the capitalist countries⁸ and of supporting "democratic and revolutionary movements in any country and especially in colonies and dependent countries."⁹

In V.I. Lenin's opinion, the advance along all these directions should ensure favorable external conditions for building socialism. He emphasized that this represents the only basis for a successful struggle to free mankind from the yoke of capitalism and from the slaughter and maiming of tens of millions of people for the purpose of resolving the question of whether the British or the Germans, the Japanese or the Americans, or some other plunderers will prevail in dividing the world."¹⁰

The Leninist conclusions had the character of a theoretical analysis and of a practical program of efforts to strengthen socialism and its positions on the world scene. It is precisely from these conclusions that our party and the fraternal communist and workers parties of socialist countries have proceeded and continue to proceed in their revolutionary transforming activity.

It is precisely these conclusions whose correctness has been demonstrated by the entire course of history that inspired the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the November (1982), June and December (1983), and Extraordinary February (1984) Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, which defined the course toward more fully opening up and utilizing the advantages of socialism as a social system, accelerating the country's development, increasing its might and defense capability, and comprehensively raising the standard of living of the Soviet people.

History has confirmed that the successful development of socialism, the growth of its economic and defense might, and its political activeness have become the main factor of the correlation of forces on the international scene changing to the advantage of peace and progress. Since 1917, imperialism has lost its monopolist position in the world and ceased to be the only social system in the world. Its decline has begun.

After 1945, an entire complex of socialist states arose side by side with the Soviet Union. This represented a major change in the correlation of forces that in many respects necessitated the subsequent collapse of the colonial system. However, at the beginning, the community of socialism was still inferior to the imperialist opponent according to its economic and military might.

However, on the boundary between the sixties and seventies, the fundamental turn to the advantage of socialism became clear. It was the result of the successes of the socialist countries in building the new society that is now entering a higher stage of advance along the path of progress. The USSR is solving the tasks of perfecting developed socialism. This process is either in progress or is beginning in other countries of the community. The restructuring of the society on socialist principles is being completed in a number of states. The economic cooperation between the socialist states is assuming a qualitatively new character.

Under these conditions, much is changing--both in essence and in form--in the historic creativity of the peoples of the fraternal states. For, the socialist world is leaving behind the period when it lived on the basis inherited from the past. It is building and, in our country, it has already built, its own basis of development. Under these conditions, all problems appear in a new way. Life had demonstrated that this period has proved to be objectively very complex and that quick and correct solutions cannot be found for all problems by far. Thus, the new society must determine the ways of finding the true socialist solutions for the tasks of effectively developing all aspects of production at a high level of quality, without any example to follow, for the first time in history. A certain inertia, the habit of old forms and methods of work, conservatism, passiveness, and a shortage of constructive initiatives hinder the progress at times.

However, the CPSU and other fraternal parties of the countries of socialism are finding the correct solutions for the problems that arise. The economic and political might of the socialist community continues to confidently grow.

In the economic sphere, the states of the socialist community, which account for more than one third of the world's industrial production, have reached the level at which they surpass the capitalist world in any of the three main centers of its power.

The measures on increasing the effectiveness and qualitative level of production, perfecting the system of economic management, and activating the participation of the working masses in its functioning that are now being taken in the USSR and a majority of other countries of socialism should ensure the further progress of the economy. The results of the economic development of the USSR and of other fraternal countries in 1983 provide sufficiently convincing evidence of this.

According to the available calculations, in the immediate future, the annual rate of growth of the national income of the states of the socialist community will be between 5 and 7 percent. This rate is considerably higher than the rate on which the developed capitalist countries can count.

The planned measures on perfecting socialist economic integration should play a considerable role in the sphere of solving such problems common to the CEMA countries as those of the technological reequipment of production, the efficient utilization of resources, the preparation and introduction of new technical equipment and materials, the raising of the quality of production to the level of world standards, and the fullest satisfaction of the working people's demand for high quality goods. The data on the development of the national economies of the countries of socialism convincingly show that, in the economic sphere, the correlation of forces will continue to change to the advantage of socialism.

In the military-strategic sphere, the parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO achieved at the beginning of the seventies represented a major success of socialism. "The military-strategic equilibrium between socialism and imperialism objectively contributes to peaceful coexistence," Yu.V. Andropov noted. "The achievement of this equilibrium is one of the most important results achieved in recent decades. It has demanded considerable efforts and resources of our people and the peoples of other countries of the socialist community and we will not allow it to be broken. We will further continue to do everything necessary to ensure the security of our country and of our friends and allies and will continue to further increase the combat strength of the Soviet Armed Forces, the powerful factor of containing the aggressive aspirations of imperialist reaction."¹¹

It is sometimes said that defending the necessity of parity allegedly means striving to preserve the current very high level of the arms race. This is not so at all. For, first, setting the question of parity, the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries thereby strive to put an end to the arms race. And, second, as is known, at the same time they are striving to achieve a real and sizeable reduction in arms, that is, not raising, but considerably lowering the level of the opposite military positions." "The Soviet people," K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his speech to voters on 2 March 1984, "do not want an increase in weapons but rather a reduction on both sides."¹²

Of course, in cases where imperialism adopts measures to break the existing military-strategic parity, the countries of socialism cannot but restore this parity. So it has happened recently in Europe in particular. The deployment of new American nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries has compelled the countries of socialism to adopt countermeasures, neutralizing the new threat of a military nature thus created and restoring parity. Of course, these countermeasures are maintained strictly within those bounds dictated by the actions of the NATO countries.

Finally, on a political-diplomatic plane, the initiative in the world arena is invariably held by the countries of socialism, the socialist community, and the Soviet state. It is precisely they which have made an impressive sum of proposals that show humanity the way forward to stable and peaceful coexistence. The program of peace drawn up and implemented by the CPSU is by no means a "document that has been written off," as some claim in the West.

On the contrary, one can note with satisfaction that the broadest social forces and many states, political parties, and organizations are now inspired in their activities by those ideas that were first put forward by the CPSU.

Despite active opposition from the West, many of our proposals have nevertheless been adopted and embodied in interstate documents of great principled significance. One can say with certitude that all of the most major foreign political actions of recent years--from the Helsinki Final Act to a series of agreements aimed at limiting the arms race--have been the result of foreign political initiatives on the part of the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community.

In this respect, the results of the 38th session of the UN General Assembly, which adopted a series of important resolutions aimed at preventing a nuclear war and at stopping the arms race, are indicative. The authors or co-authors of these resolutions were the countries of socialism. And they received the overwhelming majority of votes. The United States and its allies found themselves cast in an isolation that was far from resplendent.

The influence of socialism as a most important factor of peace and progress has significantly increased. Naturally, in speaking of this, we in no way rule out the great role that the countries of Asia and Africa, liberated from the colonial yoke, many Latin American states, the international workers movement, and other democratic and anti-imperialist forces have played and continue to play in the contemporary world. However, the scientific analysis of any social process presupposes the singling out of the main, decisive factor. This factor is the growth of world socialism and its comprehensive strengthening. Incidentally, in many ways the potential of other peace-loving forces are also revealed precisely under the influence of socialism and with its support. At one time V.I. Lenin wrote: "...the fact that a country has appeared that has resisted world imperialism for 3 years has considerably changed the international situation throughout the whole world..."¹³ Now, when it is no longer just one such country that exists and is successfully developing on this planet, but a whole system of socialist states, and when this system has become a powerful bastion of anti-imperialist struggle, the international situation could not but change even more considerably.

III

It is impossible to correctly understand all these changes without considering another important factor of world development--the continuing deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Qualitatively new features appeared in this sphere by the seventies.

The particular feature of the general crisis of capitalism is, as is well known, the fact that it is developing under the influence of the internal laws of the capitalist mode of production and of processes that are external with regard to capitalism, that is, primarily the appearance and development of socialism. There is no doubt that the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism in the seventies, as well as in the subsequent period, was in many ways also connected with the strengthening of the positions of socialism and with the process of the national and social liberation of the peoples

who were developing under socialism's objective influence. But, of course, the decisive role was played by the internal contradictions of capitalist society.

Some Marxist scientists have recently expressed the point of view that the time has now come to state the fact that the general crisis of capitalism is entering a qualitatively new stage. In our opinion, this is perhaps premature. However, it is clear that the contemporary stage of imperialism's development requires deepened study, since it is marked by a number of new phenomena.

As is well known, at the end of the sixties and beginning of the seventies, Marxist thinking came to the conclusion that the particular features of contemporary capitalism are explained to a considerable extent by the fact that it is adapting itself to the new situation in the world.

The corresponding conclusion was stated in the documents of the 1969 International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties. It was noted in particular that the monopolies have made extensive use of state regulation of the economy and the achievements of scientific-technical progress for strengthening their positions, increasing the effectiveness and rates of development of production, and intensifying the exploitation of the working people.¹⁴ This policy has ensured for capitalism certain advantages for some time. However, as the 24th CPSU Congress emphasized, it has not led and could not lead to the stabilization of capitalism as a system.

What is more, the adaptation of imperialism to the new situation and, in particular, the intensification of state-monopolistic trends and the utilization of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution have ultimately led to a deepening of the main fundamental contradictions in the capitalist mode of production. It is precisely on this basis that fundamentally new phenomena, affecting imperialism's productive forces, production relations, and superstructure, have arisen in imperialism's development during the last one and a half to two decades.

V.I. Lenin once pointed out that the trend engendered by the monopolies to slow down technical progress does not lead to the automatic collapse of capitalism through the "corking up" of its productive forces. He foresaw the possibility of those periods when, "as a whole, capitalism would grow immeasurably more rapidly than before..."¹⁵ In the fifties and sixties, as a result of the use of state-monopolistic regulation and the application of the achievements of science and technology, the growth of capitalism's productive forces was somewhat accelerated and, the main thing, those forces underwent a qualitative change. The technical base of industry, primarily in the developed countries, was renewed owing to the introduction of automation, and then of computer technology and robots.

The opportunity arose for resolving many problems facing mankind (for example, energy and ecological problems and so forth), and for satisfying the vital needs of the population. This did not happen, however. The fruits of the increased productive forces were utilized by the monopolies (and primarily by the monopolies working for war), whose rates of profit increases significantly exceeded the growth rates of production and of the national income.

Today the words of V.I. Lenin written by him as early as on the eve of World War I resound with particular denunciatory force: "Wherever one looks, at every step one encounters tasks which mankind is fully able to fulfill IMMEDIATELY. Capitalism stands in the way.... Civilization, freedom, and wealth under capitalism put one in mind of a rich man who has guzzled himself and who is rotting alive and prevents that which is young from living."¹⁶

The changes in capitalism's productive forces have entailed further changes in its production relations, too. These changes have progressed in the very direction predicted by V.I. Lenin. The question is primarily one of the further monopolization of production and of the concentration of society's wealth in the hands of a dwindling number of giant industrial-financial groups and associations. This process has developed both within the framework of every imperialist country taken individually and, what is particularly important, on an international scale. The internationalization of capitalist production and trade was particularly clearly reflected in the rapid development and strengthening of the positions of the transnational corporations, which, at the beginning of the eighties, accounted for approximately 40 percent of industrial production and 60 percent of the foreign trade of the capitalist world, and approximately 80 percent of developed technology.¹⁷

While analyzing the trends of imperialism's economic development, V.I. Lenin noted the pronounced contradictory nature of its consequences. With the passage of time, the conditions are objectively formed under which "some basic properties of capitalism begin to turn into their opposite."¹⁸ What V.I. Lenin primarily had in mind was the fact that imperialism "leads in real earnest to the most comprehensive socialization of production..."¹⁹ In other words, the strengthening of the positions of monopolistic capital and the further growth of its concentration and centralization create the fundamental prerequisites for "a period of transition from capitalism to a higher socioeconomic structure."²⁰

In our time, the gigantic growth of the monopolies, which has been increased by the progressive development of state-monopolistic trends, makes production truly social. But the properties of this production, including the owners of the huge production complexes which no longer supply just one country, but whole groups of states and even the whole capitalist world, are still a small group of multi-millionaires. Hence the unprecedented deepening of capitalism's main contradiction--the contradiction between the social nature of the productive forces and the private-ownership nature of production relations. Even bourgeois economists are more and more frequently forced to admit the existence and acuteness of this contradiction. However, the main thing is that this contradiction leads to the growing instability of the capitalist economy. A series of economic crises, which marked the seventies and the beginning of the eighties, have clearly shown: The narrow framework of contemporary capitalism's production relations is even less able to ensure it at least somewhat stable economic growth.

With any fluctuations in production, and even when production is on the rise, massive unemployment still continues, the disorder in the international monetary and financial system is intensified, and the economic contradictions between the various capitalist countries and their groups become more and more

acute. "Contradictions within the imperialist system are being aggravated and the struggle for markets and for raw material and energy sources is becoming more intense. The Japanese and West European monopolies are competing with American capital more and more successfully, including in the U.S. domestic market," the 26th CPSU Congress noted.

The further monopolization of production also causes an increasingly sharp social differentiation of society. The number of the poor, homeless, illiterate, and discriminated against is increasing in all the capitalist countries, and above all, in the United States. This shows with particular force imperialism's inability to deal with the social consequences of the scientific-technical revolution, which dooms millions and millions of working people to unemployment and poverty. As a result, an ever greater quantity of socially explosive material is accumulating in the countries of the capitalist world.

In other words, as V.I. Lenin foresaw, the development of imperialism does not lead to a concealment of social contradictions (of which right-wing revisionist and liberal-bourgeois theoreticians have dreamed and continue to dream), but to their further exacerbation. The antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and between the monopolies and all the people, is deepening. And indeed, today both these contradictions are becoming more acute and sometimes engender spontaneous but very deep social conflicts which draw into their orbit even those strata of society still recently considered inert and incapable of action.

Let us take the end of the sixties, for example.

The stormy events of May 1968 in France, the "hot fall" in Italy, and the actions of the blacks and youth in the United States testified to the direct and acute sociopolitical clash of the working people with the whole system of power of monopolistic capital. At the end of the seventies and beginning of the eighties, purely political problems, and primarily the problem of war and peace, were already at the center of the antagonism between the monopolies and the people. This antagonism took the form of open and active protest by the masses against the policies of the capitalist governments.

The changes taking place within the political superstructure of contemporary capitalism are also closely connected with these processes. "The political superstructure above the new economy and above monopolistic capitalism," wrote V.I. Lenin, "...is a turn AWAY FROM democracy TOWARD political reaction.... "Political reaction suits the monopolies."²¹

In our time, capitalism's political superstructure is acquiring an ever more reactionary nature on the basis of combining the strength of the monopolies with the strength of the state. The structure and functioning of state authority, the legislative system, and the repressive apparatus are adapting themselves more and more strongly to the requirements of an antinational and antiworker policy.

Now, of course, in the conditions of the significant growth and increasing activeness of the forces opposing the monopolies, imperialism is compelled to mask its real intentions and actions more carefully. In actual fact, never before has the anti-national nature of capital's domination been so obvious as now. But, at the same time, never before has so much been said about the "All-national" nature of the bourgeois state, which supposedly serves the interests of the "whole nation."

The deepest contradiction between the orientation of the contemporary bourgeois state, on the one hand, and the society's real needs and the nation's real interests, on the other, together with growing pressure and arbitrariness of the monopolies, engender increasing crisis phenomena at all levels of the capitalist superstructure. This is evident both within the sphere of politics and the spheres of ideology, morals, and culture.

In this very way, V.I. Lenin's forecast of comprehensive nature of imperialism's decline is confirmed. Today, even bourgeois politicians and scientists who can by no means be called progressive are forced to admit: The imperialist system is experiencing a profound crisis from top to bottom. Comparisons between the present stage of capitalism's development and the last period of the Roman Empire's existence, the period of its decline and decay, are becoming more and more frequent.

The conclusion drawn by the 1960 International Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties that, at the present stage, the deepening of the crisis of capitalism will take place precisely in a situation of peace, in a situation of competition between two systems, and as a result of profound social changes in the international arena in favor of the forces of peace and democracy, has proved to be completely correct.²² In this way the theses of leftist "theoreticians," who have predicted that in the conditions of peace the development of the crisis of capitalism will supposedly slow down, have been refuted. The claims made by bourgeois ideologists to the effect that measures adopted in the fifties and sixties would ensure the stabilization of capitalism and give it new stability have likewise come to grief. On the eve of the seventies, leading representatives of bourgeois futurology predicted a "decade of flourishing," practically the beginning of a new "golden age" for capitalism. Now this kind of utterance is not heard. Conclusions of a very gloomy tone have taken their place.

Here, for example, is the opinion of the IMF: "It became clear during the seventies that the traditional macroeconomic measures adopted by governments with the aim of stabilizing their economies were not yielding, so it seemed, any results. Earlier, a tougher budget and currency policy had made it possible to cope with inflation and to slow down the difficulties of the economy, while measures to stimulate production had made it possible to reduce unemployment and to renew economic activeness. Now, the stimulation of production is increasing inflation without increasing employment, while a tough economic policy is increasing unemployment without reducing inflation." The capitalist economy has been characterized by IMF specialists as "a ship that has strayed off course."

In the appraisal of the last decades of the development of capitalist society at the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee Plenum it was noted: "...We are witnesses to the considerable deepening of the general crisis of this social system. The methods with the aid of which capitalism managed to maintain the relative stability of its development in the postwar period are losing their effectiveness more and more.... Imperialism has become entangled in internal and interstate antagonisms, shocks, and conflicts."²³

IV

Imperialism's initial reaction to the changed situation in the world at the beginning of the seventies was its forced agreement to international detente. Basically, detente objectively signified a step toward the Western leaders acknowledging the real state of affairs existing in the world arena, and their admission of the fact that imperialism "was no longer able either to cancel out the historical achievements of socialism or to stop the continued advance of progressive forces or the movement for the liberation and independence of peoples."²⁴ In other words, detente signified imperialism's retreat from the frontiers it had traditionally occupied. However, this retreat was strictly forced. As U.S. President R. Nixon and his closest collaborators emphasized at the beginning of the seventies, there simply remained no other way out for the West at that time, since it had lost its supremacy--primarily on the military-strategic plane--with regard to socialism. "We must admit that not one major power can gain a decisive advantage over the other," the U.S. President stated in 1971, "Consequently, at the present moment there exists no alternative to negotiations." "We are compelled to coexist," he said in another place.

However, while grudgingly agreeing to detente, imperialism, naturally, proceeded in this respect from its own calculations. Now, when many documents, memoirs, and research papers have been published which relate to the seventies, one can already completely clearly conceive that these calculations amounted to the following:

First, to gain time in order to prepare themselves in every possible way and make a fresh attempt to change the correlation of world forces in their favor. Having declared a transition from "the era of confrontation to the era of negotiations," R. Nixon emphasized at the same time that he would definitely try to "restore the incontestable American military supremacy over the Soviet Union." In accordance with this, his administration, and then the G. Ford administration, signed documents on detente while simultaneously adopting decisions that laid the foundation for the present, particularly dangerous spiral of the arms race. Thus, at the beginning of the seventies, work was begun on building the Trident submarine and the corresponding missiles; the MX intercontinental missile; the Pershing II and intermediate-range cruise missiles; and the B-1 bomber.

During the same years, active preparations of new plans for both a "limited" and a "global" war against the USSR were simultaneously underway ("Memorandum on the Adoption of Decisions in the Sphere of National Security" and other documents relating to 1974).

Second, the West's calculations also consisted in the fact that, in conditions when contacts between the countries were expanding and mutual economic and cultural exchanges were being activated, new possibilities were opening up for influencing the policies of the socialist countries with the aim of changing these policies in a direction necessary to imperialism. H. Kissinger, for example, stated completely clearly on the eve of the seventies: "...The aim of American policy is to assist a favorable change in Soviet society,... and to ensure a domestic political turn in the Soviet Union." Z. Brzezinski later concretized this "aim" thus: "If detente must be something greater than transient and basically unstable relations, if it must be, as one would imagine, all-embracing, then this is achievable only if there is a perhaps slow but fundamental turn in Soviet domestic and foreign policy." First the doctrines of "laying bridges" and "converging" were used to achieve precisely this aim, and later it was the slogan of the struggle for "human rights," which was used to substantiate the support for and encouragement to all forces hostile to socialism.

Further, imperialism's calculation consisted in the fact that, as it was supposed in the West, detente would make it possible to stop the revolutionary struggle in the world (under the slogan of "extending" peaceful coexistence to relations between antagonistic classes and between the oppressors and the oppressed), but the main thing was that it would make it possible to end socialism's aid to fighters for national and social liberation. It was emphasized in the collective research of a group of seasoned anticommunists headed by R. Pipes and R. Conquest, for example, that detente would be acceptable for the West only if the countries of socialism were to renounce their support for the forces of national and social liberation.²⁵

Finally, it was presupposed that achieving all the aforementioned aims would make it possible to "bring order" to the Western world itself, and, in particular, to mitigate the acuteness of the inner imperialist contradictions and crisis situations. This end was to have been served by the formation of the "Trilateral Commission," (June 1973), which intended to improve "international cooperation, which is particularly necessary now when democracy in the United States, Europe, and Japan is undergoing a serious crisis." The same task was also set the traditional (since the end of 1975) conferences of the highest leaders of leading powers in the capitalist world.

One detail is revealing: Detente (as it is seen in the West) has been characterized more than once in NATO publications as "a continuation of the cold war by other means."

But the real results of detente have turned out to be very different from those hoped for by the leading circles in the imperialist countries. First of all, their calculation that socialism would be undermined from within and that the unity of the socialist community would be destroyed fell through. Of course, if detente had been continued, and if it could have been extended to the military sphere, and if the arms race were stopped, the countries of socialism would have been able to achieve still greater results. But even being limited and incomplete, detente has shown: In the conditions of the strengthening of peaceful coexistence, socialism is given additional possibilities to develop.

At the same time, since detente signified a certain retreat of imperialism's most reactionary and aggressive circles from the proscenium of political life, it facilitated the liberation struggle of the forces of social progress.

It was precisely during the years of detente that major social changes of a progressive nature took place in the world: A unified socialist Vietnam was formed; the last, Portuguese, colonial empire collapsed, in the place of which a series of independent and democratic states arose; and the fascist dictatorial regimes in Portugal, Greece, Spain, and so forth crashed.

"Detente," noted K.U. Chernenko, "is a multiplan, multimeasure process. Detente is indisputably the path to peace and cooperation. But not only this. The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that detente opens up scope for democratizing international life in general and increases the political activeness of the broadest masses. Detente is inseparable from recognition of the right of every people to independently decide its own fate and to choose its own way of life and direction of social development.

"It is hoped that the sociopolitical status quo can be preserved or "frozen"--this is a reactionary utopia and nothing more. And life has convincingly proved this."²⁶

Detente has also not brought about the consolidation, so desired by Washington, of the foundations of American hegemony in the capitalist world. On the contrary, at the beginning of the seventies, the tendency to relatively greater independence on the part of the United States' NATO allies revealed itself. Then the West began to talk very loudly of the crisis of "Atlantic solidarity."

Finally, on an economic plane, the years of detente were likewise far from marked by the stabilization and "recovery" of the capitalist economy. What is more, a series of cyclical and structural crises in the seventies and eighties seriously undermined the mechanism of its functioning. The U.S. military-industrial complex was clearly alarmed, thinking that its positions at the beginning of the seventies, especially after the failure of the American aggression in Vietnam, had been weakened to a certain extent. Detente, and especially real steps along the path to arms reduction, were irreconcilably at variance with the very conditions of the existence and prosperity of the military-industrial complex.

All this taken as a whole was regarded by the most reactionary and conservative circles in the West, and particularly in the United States, as a dangerous challenge. The conclusion drawn was simple: It is time to put an end to detente, it is time to return to confrontation.

It was precisely under this slogan that the activities of the "new right-wing" movement which had formed in the United States by the middle of the seventies developed. A mass of organizations formed by it, among the most influential of which were the National Conservative Political Action Committee (which later played a leading role in R. Reagan's election campaign), and also the Committee on Present Danger, in the activities of which the future president of the United States participated from 1977, appeared in the country's political arena.

The "crusade" policy signified that imperialism including primarily American imperialism, had shifted from the strategy of adaptation to the strategy of forcibly changing the situation. The most aggressive circles of imperialism have indeed set themselves an unattainable goal, the goal of erecting a barrier on the path of progressive changes in the world and of recapturing for themselves the role of the ruler of the destinies of peoples.

And in this connection it is impossible not to recall V.I. Lenin's statement that, striving to intensify the confrontation with socialism the imperialists are thereby "struggling to artificially postpone the downfall of capitalism."²⁷

In the middle and latter half of the seventies, the USSR as well as its allies spared no effort to strengthen detente and its advance and, in particular, its extension to the military sphere. In the middle of the seventies, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries made scores of proposals concerning the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons, the reduction of conventional weapons, primarily in central Europe, and the liquidation of entire types of weapons (for instance, the chemical and radiological ones). These proposals were incorporated in the Peace Program put forward by the 25th CPSU Congress (in 1976). The contacts and negotiations were initiated between the USSR and the United States on many acute problems, in particular on the problems of limiting and, subsequently, reducing military activities in the Indian Ocean region, the problems concerning the limitation of arms trade, on completely stopping the nuclear tests, and banning the development of anti-satellite weapons. The Soviet Union was prepared to move toward agreements on all of these problems, naturally, on the basis of the principle of parity and equal security. However, from the very beginning, Washington procrastinated and sabotaged the negotiations in progress and then unilaterally broke them off.

There is no shortage of claims according to which the Soviet Union allegedly provided the motive for aggravating the situation by taking a number of "imprudent" actions. What is involved in this connection is the fact that, just as previously, in the seventies, the USSR had continued to follow its course of supporting the national liberation and progressive forces and movements. This line is at times presented as a manifestation of "expansionism" or "export of the revolution." Both of these claims are a gross lie. In extending its support to the forces of progress, the USSR has not sought and seeks no advantages or privileges for itself. It has never built and is not building any military bases, it has made no capital investments anywhere to derive income from them, it has not seized sources of raw materials in other countries, and it has imposed no political conditions on the latter. Then what kind of "expansionism" is involved in this connection?

As regards the speculation in connection with the "export of the revolution," it is known everywhere that the Soviet Union has never organized or "instigated" a single revolution. The revolutions are the result of the natural course of events, a result of the development of internal contradictions of capitalism and colonialism in the respective countries of the world. The revolutions of the seventies, just like the preceding revolutions, were prepared, initiated, and carried out by the peoples

aspiring to freedom. However, when dangers began to threaten these revolutions and when they were subjected to aggressive attacks by the United States and other imperialist states, the Soviet Union naturally came to their aid. This assistance was fully in accord with the principles incorporated in the UN Charter and other international documents of the postwar period which recognize the legitimacy of the right of peoples to independently determine their fate and, in contrast, proclaim as unlawful any attempts to interfere with any means in the fulfillment of this right. The USSR and its allies extended their assistance to the revolutionary forces only in response to the actions of imperialism.

It is quite natural that socialism's support for the revolutionary achievements of such countries as Angola, Ethiopia, and Afghanistan "irritated" imperialism. This is not surprising because their plans to return the aforementioned countries to the bosom of neocolonial dependence have failed. The policy of supporting the struggle of peoples for their freedom, followed by the countries of socialism, has and does fully correspond to the interests of the consolidation of peace. As K.U. Chernenko remarked at the Extraordinary Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on behalf of the cause of peoples--this is also necessary and important today for the direction of the struggle for a stable peace in the world."

V

The turn of imperialism toward promoting tension cannot be understood without taking into account such an important circumstance--important in principle--as the unprecedented growth of the role of militarism in the life of the capitalist society in recent decades.

Analyzing the essence of imperialism, V.I. Lenin emphasized as early as at the beginning of the century: "Militarization now permeates the entire social life. Imperialism is a fierce struggle between big powers for the division and partition of the world, and for this reason it must necessarily lead to a further militarization in all countries, including the neutral and the small ones."²⁸ He wrote: "...imperialism that is, the monopolistic capitalism, which finally and definitely matured only in the 20th century, is distinguished, in its fundamental ECONOMIC characteristics, by the lowest level of peaceableness and of devotion to freedom and by the greatest development of the military everywhere." And he added: "The failure to notice this... means falling to the level of a most ordinary lackey of the bourgeoisie."²⁹

The growth of militarism as an economic and social phenomenon is stimulated by the transformation of the military-industrial complex into a most important component part of the monopolist capital; by the internationalization of this complex, which is essentially becoming transnational; and by the intensification of the state monopolist trends contributing to strengthening the ties between monopolies, the military, and the most reactionary wing of political forces.

It goes without saying that the growth of militarism has been provoked by imperialism's intention to weaken and undermine the world of socialism by any means; by the expansionist strategy of financial capital, above all American

capital, and by its aspirations to consolidate its positions in the former colonial world; and by the deepening class contradictions in the capitalist world and the policy of the leading capitalist groups aimed at providing guarantees for themselves in the event of possible revolutionary shocks. Of course, what is also apparent in this connection is that it is hoped to overcome the increasing economic difficulties through a militarization of the economy; and to strengthen the positions of each of the three power centers (the United States, Japan, and Western Europe) under the conditions of an intensifying competition among them. It is by means of the arms race that the United States plans to tie its competitors more firmly to itself and weaken their opposition to the dictates of the American capital.

Analyzing the essence of imperialism, V.I. Lenin demonstrated that this is a monopolist capitalism, a parasitic capitalism, and a dying capitalism. Militarism most strikingly reflects all these characteristics and traits.

Militarism, together with the four main aspects of monopoly singled out by V.I. Lenin (the monopoly resulting from a concentration of production; the monopoly resulting from the seizure of the sources of raw materials; the monopoly resulting from banking operations; and the monopoly resulting from colonial policy) has now essentially become the fifth main aspect of monopoly. This fact has found its expression in the formation of military-industrial complexes in all the main capitalist countries.

The appearance of the military-industrial complexes reflects a new stage in the monopolization of production and even further deepens the monopolist essence of contemporary imperialism.

The military expenditures of the capitalist countries now amount to a total that exceeds the gross national product of all African countries 1.5 times. They are approximately equal to the gross national product of all Latin American countries. Some 5 to 10 percent of the basic types of raw materials and 20 to 40 percent of the most valuable and rare types of these materials are now used for military purposes. Approximately 60 million people, including an enormous part of the most highly skilled specialists, are now employed in the military sphere (throughout the world). More than 500,000 people, or 20 percent of all scientific workers, taken away from work in the vitally important branches of peaceful production, are now engaged in the scientific research and studies in the same sphere.

Of course, imperialism still has considerable reserves at its disposal. But its insolvency has already revealed itself in a number of aspects. Now even the people who stand very far from the ideas of communism admit that a system that has created a mortal threat to the existence of mankind and which is seeking salvation for itself by preparing a catastrophe that could destroy the entire civilization is truly obsolete.

It is no accident at all that the United States has become the leader of militarism and a country where the militarization of society has reached the highest degree. In his time, V.I. Lenin characterized American imperialism

as the "freshest," as the "strongest," and the very last one participating in the imperialist struggle for the share of profits. "The American billionaires, these modern slave owners," Lenin wrote, "have opened a particularly tragic page in the bloody history of bloody imperialism."³⁰ The present deeds of the U.S. Administration are convincing proof of the correctness of the Leninist appraisal.

American imperialism in our time is, so to say, the "highest achievement" of imperialism, the highest point of its development. Just as capitalism in England was the classical capitalism of the 19th century, today U.S. imperialism is the classical imperialism of our time.

This is a worldwide exploiter octopus, unprecedented in history, which more and more lives from plundering other countries, including both the developed and developing ones. Finally, this is the best illustration of the fact that imperialism is a dying system. The incessant economic shocks and the deep political and moral crisis compel even American researchers to conclude that this system is truly outdated. In his book "The Zero-Sum Society,"

L. Thurow, professor of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, writes: "Our entire society is full of unhealthy, chronic, and alarming problems which cannot be solved by our political-economic system... Seeing our inability to solve these problems, many people reach the conclusion that the present American system has lost the moral ground for its existence."

All the aforementioned traits of American imperialism predetermines its special aggressiveness, make it the leader of the most reactionary forces of our time, and turn it into the source of a constant military threat to all of mankind.

The aforementioned doctrine of "crusade" against socialism is the fullest expression of this threat. This doctrine, an openly proclaimed program of a large-scale exportation of counterrevolution, is aimed at strengthening capitalism where it still exists and at restoring it where it has already been liquidated. This is a program of unlimited aggression and an open manifesto of the contemporary counterrevolution.

Some of our Western interlocutors try at times to convince us that the "programs" of this kind are nothing other than "rhetoric" and "only words" to which no particular attention should be paid.

However, the unprecedented bellicose declarations are certainly not just harmless rhetoric. They are embodied in perfectly concrete actions of the United States, the actions whose meaning and substance are widely known.

And these are the results of the implementation of the aforementioned policy.

A sharp exacerbation of international tension, activation of the arms race, increased military danger, and danger of a nuclear war. The deployment of American nuclear missiles in Western Europe has created an additional threat which is very serious from this point of view:

An activation of the forces of counterrevolution everywhere and uninterrupted attempts at exporting counterrevolution. American imperialism's attempts at interventions in order to suppress the liberation forces follow one after another. The exportation of counterrevolution, and the terrorism in relation to all peoples have become an inseparable part of U.S. state policy;

The stake of the most reactionary forces of the capitalist world in moving into a counteroffensive. It is apparent in the United States. It has found its expression in the election victories of the right-wing parties in Britain, the FRG, and Japan in recent years. It is also made apparent by the growth of the number of various neofascist and profascist organizations that now exist in 60 countries.

In the light of what has been said above, it is possible to make a substantiated conclusion about the question as to who is directly and immediately responsible for the present international crisis. The responsibility for it fully and completely falls on the shoulders of imperialism and primarily American imperialism.

There was also international tension and an arms race taking place at the beginning of our century. However, it was the competitive struggle of the imperialists that provided the basis for those developments. In the thirties, the tension and the arms race were primarily engendered by the "concerns" of the leading imperialist states over the partition of the world and of the spheres of influence. What was new then was the fact that both groups of imperialists, which were at loggerheads with each other, strived to resolve all their contradictions at the expense of socialism. Of course, contradictions between the imperialist states also exist today. However, it is precisely the social factor--the aspiration of imperialism to "replay" history, turn it back, and stop the social progress--that represents the motive force of the current exacerbation of tension on the international scene.

The sources of the current international crisis are closely connected with the very approach of imperialism to the nature and future prospects of mutual relations between the two systems. Imperialism refuses to reconcile itself to the legitimacy of the existence and strengthening of socialism. It continues to proceed from the view that socialism is a "historic anomaly" which must be liquidated.

There is no doubt that the existence of the two systems, their principled opposition to each other, and the irreconcilability of their ideologies are an objective fact. The entire question in this connection is how to approach this fact and what forms the antagonism between the two systems should assume. It is a well known truth that form is essential. And the form of antagonism between the two systems in the nuclear century is all the more essential.

Socialism proceeds from the necessity and the obligatory nature of peaceful coexistence of competition between the two social systems. "Transferring the ideological contradictions to the sphere of interstate relations has never brought anything good to anyone who resorted to this in external affairs," Yu.V. Andropov noted.

"And now, in the nuclear century, this is simply absurd and impermissible. Turning the antagonism between ideas into military antagonism would cost all mankind too much." Socialism is confident that, on the basis of a peaceful contest, its principles will inevitably triumph. It is convinced that precisely the conditions of peace provide the most favorable soil for the struggle of peoples for their rights and for social progress. And contrary to this, the aggressiveness of imperialism in our time precisely proceeds from the fact that it is not convinced of the triumph of its ideals under the conditions of peace and that it is not confident of its ability to oppose the forces of progress in any other way than by means of arms.

VI

We ask: What does mankind expect? Is it possible to change imperialism's approach to world affairs and force it to recognize reality and to renounce its orientation toward a military solution of contradictions between the two systems?

Although militarism and aggressive policy are closely related to the very nature of imperialism and represent its organic part, they do not make a world war inevitable in our time. The conclusion about its possible prevention, made by the CPSU and the entire communist movement in the fifties, continues to be fully valid. And what is more, under the present conditions, it is even more strongly grounded than in the past. The entire course of events in the most recent period confirms this.

First of all, it is absolutely obvious even now that the attempt at forcible pressure on the Soviet Union and the peoples of the socialist countries has not produced results.

Emphasizing that the "transition from capitalism to socialism represents an entire historical epoch," V.I. Lenin said: "As long as this epoch does not end, the exploiters will inevitably continue to nurture hopes for a restoration and these HOPES turn into ATTEMPTS at restoration."³¹ The change of imperialism to the policy of confrontation has been naturally marked by an activation of aspirations of this type. The attacks against the USSR, military pressures, economic boycott, and psychological warfare have continued to represent the basic direction of these aspirations. In this connection, leading American public officials have directly spoken about aspirations to achieve the liquidation of the "Soviet system."

By deploying its missiles in Europe, the United States has counted on making the Soviet Union "more tractable," forcing it to make concessions and undermining its security. These calculations have failed. The countermeasures adopted by the USSR and its allies have demonstrated that imperialism will not succeed in undermining the military-strategic equilibrium to its advantage, and that the attempts at talking to socialism in the language of force are doomed to failure. Our country, our people, and the peoples of other socialist countries have been, are, and always will be ready to repel the pressure of imperialism and to comprehensively rebuff it. The highly effective efforts of the socialist community to ensure its sufficient defense

have created the conditions in which, as K.U. Chernenko has said, "no fanciers of military adventures will succeed in taking us by surprise and no potential aggressor can hope to escape a crushing counterstrike."³²

The calculations of imperialism to economically "exhaust" socialism and, in particular, to undermine the Soviet economy by means of the arms race are also naive. But the hopes of this type are expressed here and there by some people in the West.

It is useful to remind these officials that, following the incredible destruction caused to our country by the Hitlerite invaders, the Soviet people not only fully restored but also multiplied their motherland's military and economic might in the shortest historical period. The vain attempts to undermine socialism are all the more futile today when socialism has grown into a great economic force.

During the period of the October Revolution, V.I. Lenin said: "...The American imperialists have lost their head and now, under the force of objective conditions, they are compelled to tackle a task to which they are no match...." Lenin had in mind the goal of crushing Soviet power and liquidating socialism which American imperialism had set for itself. And American imperialism is once again trying to take on a task which is equally beyond its strength. And once again, just as 6 decades ago, it will fail.

Facts testify that the pressures of imperialism on developing countries and the Nonaligned Movement are also failing to achieve their aims.

Despite all its efforts, Washington has failed to break the resistance of patriotic and progressive forces in the Middle East. The direct American intervention has provoked a growing concern not only in the Arab world, but also among U.S. allies. And the actions of the United States in Central America have resulted in a situation in which nearly the entire continent has actually united against it.

This enumeration could be further extended. It convincingly shows that the American exportation of counterrevolution to developing countries is encountering increasingly serious obstacles.

The conference of the Nonaligned Movement held in Delhi in the spring of 1983 and the activities of nonaligned countries at the 38th session of the UN General Assembly clearly show that the anti-imperialist potential of developing countries is not declining but, on the contrary, increasing despite the striving of imperialism to undermine it. The significant growth of the antiwar movement of the masses has turned into a serious obstacle on the path of the implementation of Washington's plans. This is a new phenomenon in world social development. A movement on such a scale and of such a depth, a movement uniting in its ranks such broad masses of people in all parts of the world has not appeared before, if you wish, during the entire history of mankind. The strength of this movement is in the fact that it unites in its ranks not just representatives of the democratic public and the progressive parties and mass organizations. The social democratic and

socialist parties, a number of parties and organizations of liberal and even conservative orientation, trade unions, religious organizations, and some individual public workers belonging to the ruling circles of Western countries participate in it.

The present antiwar movement does not just amount to some separate events, marches, and meetings, however impressive they may be. In Western Europe it has firmly entered the everyday life of every country. It is also impossible to disregard the mass actions against the danger of war in Japan and Australia.

The antiwar movement has great potential. If it is not yet able to impose its will on the respective governments, it most certainly plays the role of a growing barrier to the implementation of the most dangerous plans of these governments.

It is true that it is said at times that the antiwar movement is of a temporary nature, so to say, of the nature of a current demand. According to another viewpoint expressed by official Washington, it is the result of a "conspiracy of communists," if not a real branch of the communist movement.

The truth is that the contemporary antiwar movement is a natural reaction of peoples to the present stage of development of imperialism, the stage at which imperialism considers militarism and the arms race as a basic element of its policy. And this movement will continue to grow as long as the activities of Washington and its allies are based on a militarist course.

Of course, slumps and booms do occur and will continue to occur in the development of the antiwar movement. Of course, a certain contradiction is inherent to it because, by its social composition, it is heterogeneous, to say the least, as it extends to virtually all social strata ranging from the workers class to the individual representatives of monopolist capital.

At times, a parallel is drawn or a comparison made between the peace movement of the fifties and the present antiwar movement. It is beyond any doubt that the present movement is a continuation of the struggle for peace which took place in the past. But, at the same time, it is a new phenomenon. It unites within itself both emotions and reason, a realistic recognition of the threat of war, and a simultaneous growing understanding of the possibilities and ways of the struggle against this threat. Participants in the antiwar movement thoroughly understand the essence of foreign and military policies. They pose against the policy of imperialism a course of defense of peace which is wellthought out and carefully worked out, at times even in great detail.

The antiwar movement was born as an expression of the will and mood of the masses. But at the same time, it has become a factor of powerful influence on the will and mood of the masses, a factor of instilling antiwar awareness.

Soon after World War I, V.I. Lenin said that, in the situation after the October Revolution, the aspirations of people for peace would turn "from vague and weak expectations" into a "clear and precise political program

and active struggle of millions of people."³³ Today, this process has gone much further. Remembering the bitter lessons of the past world wars and taking into account the terrible dangers of the thermonuclear conflict, the people of the earth are demonstrating an increasingly firm will and struggling to ensure that a new tragedy will not be permitted. The consciousness of mankind and its concern for its own fate, these are the motive force of the present antiwar movement.

A prominent role in the development of the antiwar and anti-imperialist struggle is played by the communist movement. It is not surprising that the imperialist "power centers" are devoting ever closer attention to the question of the situation within the communist movement and of the ways of influencing it. It is characteristic, for example, that in April 1975 the question of "Eurocommunism" and its prospects were discussed at a meeting of the so-called Bilderberg [name as transliterated] club (an association of representatives of right-wing Western business and political circles). The same question was on the agenda of a meeting of the leaders of leading powers in the capitalist world held in London in May 1977. "I have emphasized for a number of years now," said Z. Brzezinski at that time in one of the interviews, "that as great a pluralization of Marxism as possible would meet the interests of stability of the United States and of international politics." The aim was obvious: To push Communists from their principled class positions to the path of renouncing their fundamental convictions, the correctness and force of which have been confirmed by history.

Although imperialism's anticommunist attacks have created additional problems for communists, it has not succeeded in achieving its aim. Communists have answered Washington's policy of confrontation and antinational actions with effective counteractions.

Communists were the first to stand up against the threat of nuclear war. By their own activities, they have shown how this struggle must be waged and have drawn up its program. Considering the real situation which exists in the world, the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee plenum advanced a thesis of exceptional importance both in terms of its content and dimensions: "Communists have always been fighters against the oppression and exploitation of man by man, and today they are also fighting for the preservation of human civilization and for man's right to life." A new interweaving of Communists' tasks in the sphere of social struggle and of their tasks in the struggle to preserve and strengthen peace has arisen.

In essence, this conclusion about the basic meaning of the activities of the communist movement in our time represents the further development of the thesis of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V.I. Lenin on the historical mission of the workers class. The Communists' antiwar struggle in our time, which is closely bound up with the struggle for social progress, is their decisive contribution to the cause of rebuffing the imperialist policy of confrontation. It is a new step forward along the path to implementing the historic mission of the workers class as a whole.

Washington's stubborn attempts to achieve the maximum cohesion of the Western world on the platform of the new "cold war" have also met with failure. All talks on the necessity of "restoring the moral authority of the United States" have concealed the hope of restoring the world supremacy of the United States and its hegemony with regard to both the developed capitalist and the developing countries.

In actual fact, Washington's policy has led to a considerable deepening of the differences and contradictions within the imperialist camp. Today there are not the usual debates and contradictions within the camp of imperialism. The present contradictions in the Western camp are not simply a matter of competition struggle, although this struggle is also intensifying. It is also not simply a case of a dispute over the methods of politics. The question is one of different approaches in principle to the question of the paths along which the struggle must be waged to preserve capitalism and to strengthen its positions.

The U.S. military-industrial complex proceeds primarily from striving to ensure for itself the greatest possible profits today. For the sake of this aim, it works towards increasing the military threat, and even the risk of nuclear war. At the same time, other groups of monopolistic capital, which are less closely bound up with the arms industry or which have (as a Western Europe) greater political experience and are aware of the seriousness of the threat of war, are of the opinion that a different path must be followed: A struggle to preserve capitalism and to safeguard its profits without bringing the matter to the direct danger of a large-scale military conflict arising. These more realistically-minded circles of the Western world, although perhaps inconsistently, nevertheless actually support the idea of peaceful coexistence.

There is no doubt that both one and the other groups proceed in their positions from the interests of capitalism. In the final analysis, both one and the other direct their efforts to the struggle against socialism. But, nevertheless, the difference in the conduct and intentions of both groups must be considered.

The Soviet Union and other countries of socialism express their readiness to achieve long-term peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries. The socialist states proceed from the view that this approach is in accord with the vital interests of peoples on both sides of the social barricade that divides the world. A realistic consideration of the contemporary international reality shows that we all have all the grounds for believing that the threat of a thermonuclear war is not fatal and that mankind is in a position to control this threat and ensure peace and security.

The concentrated actions of the forces and processes opposing the adventurist strategy of American imperialism have assumed such significant proportions and begun to take on such sharp forms that Washington has considered itself compelled to resort to certain maneuvers. A typical example of this was President Reagan's speech on 16 January 1984 which American propaganda tries to present as nearly a turnabout in U.S. policy. However, having spoken his words about a desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union, the President accompanied these words not with any kind of constructive proposals in this direction, but rather with calls to carry out a policy of force. No improvement of Soviet-American relations can be achieved on this basis.

Nevertheless, the very fact of his speech is symptomatic. Essentially it shows that the policy of confrontation pursued by the administration, the policy of forcible pressure on the Soviet Union is failing and not producing the desired results, and that this policy leads to a deterioration of the international position of the United States itself and to an intensification of its isolation in the world.

The nature of the present world situation is truly unique. This situation has come about for the first time in history. We often and correctly say that our era has a transitional character. Beginning with V.I. Lenin, the communists have been pointing out that considerable difficulties would be inherent to this era. It is now clear how great the problems engendered by it are and how intense the struggle for a real advancement of the cause of social progress is.

Imperialism as a whole is on the decline. Socialism is on the rise. Its forces are increasing.

Imperialism does not base its policy and its course in world affairs on a realistic consideration of the true trends of development of the society and the existing correlation of forces, but on vain calculations about restoring its lost positions and on the illusion that the course of history can allegedly be turned back. As W. Fulbright neatly put it as early as at the beginning of the seventies, "the anti-communist ideology has spared us the necessity of taking into account concrete facts and concrete situations. Our faith delivered us, just as their faith delivered the believers in the olden times, from the necessity of sober thinking...." The same thought, though already applied to the situation at the beginning of the eighties, was expressed by S. Wance and S. Hoffmann: "Our main task is to direct the American people and not the world of the fifties,"³⁴ The question is only when will the imperialist politicians prove themselves capable of making such a turn?

In its policy, socialism relies on reality and on an accurate consideration of the present state of affairs in the world and of the objective tendencies of its further evolution. The policy of socialism is a policy of sober realism. And for this reason the future belongs to it. Of course, an extraordinary activeness of the world of socialism, and primarily of the land of the soviets, will be needed to defend the rights and achievements of peoples and to curb the imperialist adventurism. "...The Leninist policy of peace, whose fundamental lines at the contemporary historical stage have been determined by the decisions of the recent CPSU congresses, corresponds to the vital interests of the Soviet people and, essentially, to the vital interests of other peoples of the world, too," K.U. Chernenko has stated. "And we resolutely declare: We will not deviate from the policy by a single step."³⁵

The historical mission of socialism in our time is not only to build the communist society, which is superior to capitalism in every respect. Its mission is also to save mankind from the threat of death in a nuclear war. And socialism will spare no effort to fulfill this noble historic mission with honor.

FOOTNOTES

1. "K. Marx and F. Engels Works," Vol 12, p 735.
2. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 41, p 242.
3. Ibid., p 47.
4. Ibid., Vol 42, p 124.
5. Ibid., Vol 43, p 341.
6. Ibid., Vol 38, p 138.
7. Ibid., Vol 42, p 173.
8. Ibid., Vol 40, p 152.
9. Ibid., Vol 36, p 76.
10. Ibid., Vol 44, p 135.
11. Yu.V. Andropov. "Selected Statements and Articles," Moscow 1983, p 298.
12. PRAVDA, 3 March 1984.
13. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 42, p 24.
14. "International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties," Moscow 1969, Prague, pp 17-18.
15. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 27, p 422.
16. Ibid., Vol 24, p 17.
17. "The Contemporary Transnational Corporations," Moscow, 1983.
18. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 27, p 385.
19. Ibid. p 320.
20. Ibid., p 385.
21. Ibid., Vol 30, p 93.
22. "Program Documents of the Struggle for Peace, Democracy, and Socialism," Moscow, 1961.
23. Yu.V. Andropov, "Selected Speeches and Articles," p 297.

24. "Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe," Berlin, 29-30 Jun 1976, Moscow, 1976.
25. "Survey," Spring-Summer 1974.
26. K.U. Chernenko, "Selected Speeches and Articles," Moscow, 1984.
27. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 26, p 383.
28. Ibid., Vol 30, p 137.
29. Ibid., Vol 37, p 248.
30. Ibid., p 48.
31. Ibid., p 264.
32. PRAVDA, 3 March 1984.
33. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," Vol 44, p 149.
34. S. Hoffmann, S. Wance, "Building the Peace: U.S. Foreign Policy for the Next Decade," Washington, 1982, p 181.
35. Documents of the Extraordinary Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, 13 February 1984, Moscow, 1984, pp 17-18.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

CSO: 1816/8 A-F

LIMITED NUCLEAR WAR CONCEPT, U.S. POLICY CRITICIZED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 38-50

[Article by V. Kortunov: "Limited Nuclear War"--Strategy of Global Suicide"]

[Text] Among the numerous concepts prevalent across the Atlantic designed to "legitimize" the use of nuclear weapons as an "acceptable" means of achieving political goals, a special place has been occupied by the so-called "limited nuclear war" doctrine. Particularly great significance, perhaps, is imparted to this concept in both the military-political and propaganda planes. Both these aspects are closely interconnected.

It has long been known that truth is usually the first casualty of war. Any aggressor has always accompanied military operations and the preparation for war with the psychological indoctrination of the masses, fabricating this propaganda version or the other aimed at justifying an aggressive policy and portraying matters such that he is forced to "defend himself" against an outside threat or conduct a struggle in the name of "human ideals".

In our day imperialism's aggressive policy also is shrouded in a dense fog of disinformation and, as hundreds of years ago at the times of the "crusades," surrounded by a kind of messianic aura. The desire is to persuade the world public that it is by no means the expansionist aspirations of the American monopolies nor the interests of the military-industrial complex but the "sacred goal" of saving mankind from the "intrigues of communism" and the "Soviet threat"--this is the sole thing forcing the United States and other NATO countries to prepare for war.

Simultaneously American strategists' efforts are aimed at accustoming the peoples to the thought of the permissibility and inevitability even of nuclear war as something that is perfectly natural. The parallel task is being set also: playing down in every possible way the actual danger of a nuclear catastrophe and its scale and consequences and persuading people of the possibility of a "limited nuclear war," which, they say, is not as terrible as some people claim.

The "limited nuclear war" doctrine has, of course, more than just an exclusively propaganda purpose. It reflects to no less an extent the aspiration of aggressive circles of American imperialism to erase at all costs the differences between conventional and nuclear war and make nuclear blackmail a permanent factor of their foreign policy.

Having begun the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, the United States has thereby actually embarked on the creation of first-strike potential for waging a "limited nuclear war" in the European theater. It is planned to supplement this potential with the latest superpowerful and highly accurate types of nonnuclear arms designed to strike the forces and immediate rear units of the Warsaw Pact. The "limited nuclear war" doctrine is thus being given a material foundation.

I

It is not the first year that the "limited nuclear war" obsession has occupied the minds of American politicians, generals and military theorists.

Back at the end of the 1950's the then little-known Prof H. Kissinger wrote in the book "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy": "...We nonetheless cannot base all our plans on the assumption that war, should it arise, will be general only. We must look for strategic concepts which afford our diplomats the maximum freedom of action and simultaneously help determine whether the atomic age is truly fraught only with dangers and does not reveal some new opportunities."* H. Kissinger and other disciples of a policy of a strength discerned such a "new opportunity" in "limited nuclear war".

However, with the passage of time it has become increasingly clear that the prospect of man's universal mutual extermination in the event of such a conflict appreciably limits U.S. ruling circles' possibilities of bluffing with the threat of war. After all, in the appearance of an all-annihilating apocalypse war represents utter insanity and, consequently, can no longer be regarded as a permissible or at least rational means of policy.

None other than Robert S. McNamara, U.S. defense secretary in the Kennedy and then Johnson administrations, in particular, came to this conclusion. He was one of the first such high-ranking U.S. politicians to analyze seriously from the standpoints of the "flexible response" strategy (which by that time had come to replace the strategy of "massive retaliation" by means of unlimited nuclear war) the new correlation of forces and its military aspects. Having carefully weighed the various aspects of the "limited nuclear war" idea, he publicly rejected it as too risky.

The author of the so-called "counterforce" concept (war employing nuclear strikes only against military targets,) McNamara declared not long before his

* H. Kissinger, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," Moscow, 1959, p 64.

resignation as defense secretary in September 1967: "An appreciable quantitative superiority in arms, unlike in any other era in military history, cannot now be translated directly into political diktat or diplomatic advantage. Despite the fact that thermonuclear power is inconceivably tremendous and affords the practically unlimited possibility of destruction, it has proven to be of little meaning as a diplomatic instrument."* And although as Pentagon chief McNamara made considerable efforts to restore to the United States its position of military superiority which it had by that time lost, he was ultimately himself forced to acknowledge the futility of such attempts and also that there is no military-technical way of tackling the task of ensuring international security in the nuclear age.

This conclusion was shared at that time and subsequently by many other U.S. military authorities ([Dzh. Vizner] and [G.] York), top specialists in the sphere of international relations (H. Morgenthau, for instance), politicians (K. Thompson, W. Panofsky) and many others. Sober voices reasonably warned that atomic war is not a chess game which presupposes the calm and unhurried consideration of each position. Its course is not subordinate to some rules of the game stipulated in advance. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible to immediately stop it at the consent of the parties. Having once begun, it would inevitably be beyond any control and would lead to an irreversible catastrophe whose fire would consume the most eager political ambitions. "The nuclear deadlock," K. Thompson wrote in the mid-1970's. "has made a universal military clash unacceptable, and inasmuch as the big powers are deprived of the possibility of using the entire arsenal of their arms, they are left with nothing other than solving their conflicts by political means."**

This seemingly sole reasonable formulation of the question was nonetheless given a hostile reception by many people in Washington inasmuch as it shuffled the cards of the traditional "diplomatic game" which the United States had become accustomed to playing in the international arena. People here began to ponder how nonetheless to keep nuclear weapons, which are good only for collective suicide, in the arsenal of the politicians and diplomats. A persistent search for the unthinkable began: methods of rehabilitating in this form or the other power politics in the nuclear age.

As a result of these attempts the "limited nuclear war" idea again moved to the forefront. It was supported by J. Schlesinger--U.S. defense secretary in R. Nixon's administration. All subsequent administrations have paid tribute to it in one way or another. It continued to be actively developed under U.S. defense secretaries D. Rumsfeld and H. Brown and is now being developed by C. Weinberger. In addition, the "limited nuclear war" idea has gradually become increasingly dangerous. In parallel with its development the increasingly powerful and destructive military potential has been perfected from year to year, and Washington's general strategic concepts also have become increasingly aggressive.

* Quoted from A. Arbatov, "Security in the Nuclear Age and Washington's Policy," Moscow, 1980, p 43.

** K. Thompson, "Prospects and Limitations of Diplomacy" (THE REVIEW OF POLITICS No 2, 1974).

The very debate surrounding the use of nuclear weapons is engendering the extremely dangerous illusion that the scale and outcome of a nuclear confrontation may be controlled either with the aid of this military doctrine or the other or by way of the use of some particular type of arms. In fact, however, everything is precisely the other way about. Any aggressive doctrine necessarily requires a further refinement of arms. And this, in turn, leads to the modification of the military doctrine and its increasing adventurism. The one inevitably prompts the other here.

Each of Washington's military precepts--the "massive retribution," "flexible response," "realistic deterrence" and, finally, "direct confrontation" strategies--is distinguished one from another basically by the consistent toughening of their anti-Soviet thrust and increasingly candid hegemonist pretensions in respect of other countries and peoples. At the same time, in parallel with the escalation of aggressiveness at all levels of the U.S. armed forces, various-purpose weapons and various delivery systems for them are being created feverishly.

The more diverse the arsenal of the armed forces, the American Pentagon hawks claim, the greater the opportunities for the choice of both the weapons and nature of a nuclear war. They are persistently attempting here to pursue the single thought that nuclear weapons are in no way appreciably different from conventional weapons and that their use is perfectly permissible in both a global and "limited war".

The book "Strategy for Tomorrow"* by H. Baldwin, military commentator of the NEW YORK TIMES known for his closeness to the Pentagon, in which the author acted on behalf of the ultraright circles of America which altogether do not allow of the possibility of war ever being excluded from the life of society, came out in the United States back in 1970 (that is, at precisely the time when the detente process was gathering strength in Soviet-American relations). The premise that nuclear war is legitimate and that one side could come out of it with "relative military superiority" distinctly permeates all the author's arguments. For this reason, Baldwin writes, the United States should concern itself with securing the capacity for delivering a preventive nuclear strike. Any defensive strategy, he concludes, should begin with clear and definite nuclear superiority over the enemy. The summary conclusion is unequivocal--it is essential to build up the United States' nuclear potential as rapidly and on as great a scale as possible.

The positive changes in the international arena in the first half of the 1970's and the relaxation of tension should seemingly at least have shaken such notions of the American hawks. By no means! A new H. Baldwin book "The Price of Power," appeared in 1976. In it the author essentially repeats his previous premises. "We must recognize," he categorically states, "that the next war is perfectly possible anytime, anywhere and of any nature.... For this reason the nation's military power is essential, as before, and could be even more essential than ever."**

* See. H. Baldwin, "Strategy for Tomorrow," New York, 1970.

** H. Baldwin, "The Price of Power," New York, 1976, p 19.

Baldwin goes even further in his conclusions now. He suggests that the U.S. ruling circles be guided by the tactics not of defense but of offense. Given the possession of weapons of mass annihilation, he claims, the concept of "active operations" (that is essentially a first strike) becomes the main one, and this should fundamentally change America's strategic concepts inasmuch as the "best defense" against atomic bombs and intercontinental missiles is a powerful attack and the creation of "the threat of more powerful strikes against enemy territory," which naturally presupposes the "active preparation and maintenance of a fully equipped mobile force ready for an immediate offensive operation."*

Returning to the book's title, H. Baldwin formulates the conclusion: the price of power is huge; it means strenuous labor and not rest, struggle and not peace, taxes and not wealth. The motto of our century should be: "Spend sufficient on defense, and you will be saved."**

All these entreaties were uttered, we would note, only a year after the All-European Conference in Helsinki, when the detente process had achieved its greatest upsurge. They are essentially in no way different from the pronouncements of the not-unknown B. Goldwater, who in the book "Why not Victory?" (1962) proclaimed without a shadow of doubt: there is nothing to fear in a nuclear war, we should not dread casualties and ruins, the main thing is winning "a total victory over communism."***

The political irresponsibility of Goldwater's speeches is known well enough, but this senator's pathological anti-Sovietism has repeatedly been at odds with elementary commonsense. But, after all, such aggressive standpoints are also shared by certain venerable American scientists. And such opinions and conclusions are even more serious and dangerous if they are shared by politicians with the power to make decisions.

The physicist E. Teller, the "father of the hydrogen bomb," at one time, when B. Goldwater was calling for "total victory over communism" by means of nuclear war, spoke in unison with him. Speculating on his reputation as an erudite person in these matters, he asserted (in a statement at the start of the 1960's) that even if America's industrial enterprises "are totally destroyed," the people who survive, "properly provided with food and means of production," could, "working selflessly," restore the industrial potential to its prewar dimensions, and in not more than 5 years, furthermore.

While estimating with such accuracy how much time it would take to eliminate the consequences of a nuclear war, the American scientist does not, it is true, explain how it will be possible to provide the people who survive with means of production and food if the industrial potential, as he himself acknowledges, "is totally destroyed". However, this fact did not embarrass him in the least, evidently.

* H. Baldwin, "The Price of Power," New York, 1976, pp 17-18.

** Ibid., p 322.

*** See B. Goldwater, "Why not Victory? A Fresh Look at American Foreign Policy," New York, 1962, pp 149-163.

II

The statements quoted above were made mainly at the dawn of the nuclear era, when the depth of the danger had not been revealed as obviously as now. But the years have elapsed, and the nuclear arsenals of the opposed military groupings have been reinforced with increasingly powerful weapons of mass annihilation. It is common knowledge that the United States and the USSR now have the possibility of exterminating each other many times over and that if matters come to a nuclear confrontation, the whole world will be threatened.

It is, of course, possible to indulge in whatever irresponsible calculations one pleases of how many millions of people will die and how many will remain after a nuclear catastrophe and adduce this consideration or the other in support of one's highly dubious conclusions, which is being done by certain U.S. circles. But this will always only be an attempt to close one's eyes to the new reality born of contemporary scientific-technical progress, which aggressive groupings of imperialism, contrary to the vital interests of the peoples and commonsense itself, are endeavoring to put at the service of their policy.

In reality the question now is entirely different: can mankind survive a nuclear war at all and, if so, will it be able to exist on an earth poisoned by radiation? Specialists of various fields either find it difficult to answer this question, referring to the fact that the current level of knowledge does not make it possible to envisage all the consequences of the impact of nuclear war on the environment, the biosphere and man himself and his descendants, or answer in the negative. The majority of them agrees on one thing: what possibly might directly survive a nuclear war could no longer be called either civilization or the human race in our present-day notion of these concepts.

However, the American hawks have their own "logic" on this score. Thus T. Jones, assistant deputy U.S. defense secretary for strategic nuclear forces, adheres to the viewpoint that, given a proper civil defense system, it would take the United States only 2-4 years to completely eliminate the consequences of even a general nuclear war with the Soviet Union.*

The leadership of the Federal Emergency Management Agency which has been created in the United States fully shares this "optimism". Thus a certain W. (Chipmen), who is in charge of the civil defense department in this agency, declares with unusual self-assurance in the specially issued brochure "Wiping Out the Consequences of a Nuclear Strike" that this is not that complicated a matter. He, for example, categorically rejects medical men's opinion concerning the inevitability of such consequences of nuclear strikes (besides their direct casualties) as the spread of epidemics and all kinds of infectious diseases.

* See LOS ANGELES TIMES, 24 January 1982.

For "proof" of this position he appeals, incidentally, by no means to the data of modern science but makes a historical digression to the mid-14th century, when the bubonic plague epidemic, which flared up on the site of war, devastated Europe. For (Chipmen) this event represents an inspiring argument in favor of nuclear war. "For all that, 6 or 8 years after this English society had not only recovered but with God's help expeditionary troops had been formed even and a campaign against France undertaken."* The main thing, in the opinion of the brochure's author, had thereby been achieved: a sufficient number of people had survived to be able to unleash a new war.

Bravado in connection with the possibility of a nuclear confrontation has become customary in present-day America. And how could it be otherwise if Washington officials are essentially encouraging it in every way and setting the tone with the statements that "war is not the most dreadful thing," "peace is not the most important thing," that "there are things more important than peace" and so forth.

True, recently Washington's propaganda on foreign policy issues has been undergoing something of a metamorphosis: the affectedly belligerent speeches of White House representatives are giving way to just as affectedly peace-loving phraseology. President Reagan declares that today he would not call the Soviet Union the "focus of evil". He "regrets" that the Soviet-American arms reduction negotiations are "temporarily suspended" and calls on the USSR to return to Geneva. On 16 January of this year, on the eve of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building, Security and Disarmament Measures in Europe, the head of the White House delivered a big speech in which he spoke at length of "devotion to a limitation of the arms race." Of course, the Republican administration's concern is understandable. The political situation in the United States and abroad is compelling it (albeit in words) to alter the tone of its public statements with an adjustment for the exigencies of the moment.

In the international arena the United States' expansionist policy is encountering increasingly emphatic opposition. At the last, 38th, UN General Assembly session the United States found itself manifestly isolated on a number of most acute present-day problems, primarily those directly connected with preventing nuclear war. The start of the deployment of the American Pershings and cruise missiles on the European continent stimulated the antiwar movement even more. Whence Washington's endeavor to evade responsibility for the breakdown of the disarmament negotiations and to attempt again and again to shift the blame for this race onto someone else.

But what is the worth of Reagan's pseudo-peace-loving tirades and his assurances of his aspiration to an understanding with the Soviet Union if they are not confirmed by any constructive proposals? More, if in the same speech the U.S. President again emphasized the intention of America's ruling circles to continue to build up military power and, what is most important,

* LOS ANGELES TIMES, 24 January 1982.

if simultaneously with pharisaical assurances about the United States' love of peace the military-industrial complex is multiplying and perfecting the arsenal of aggression incessantly and at a growing pace? "In short," as A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR foreign minister, observed in a speech at the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe on 18 January 1984, "the present U.S. Administration is one which thinks in terms of war and acts accordingly."

It is important to stress that while advancing the "limited nuclear war" concept the Pentagon at the same time, first, has never ceased to prepare for a global war and, second, has invariably recognized and continued to recognize the priority of the refinement of first-strike weapons. Whence it is clear that a "limited nuclear war" is conceived of by American strategists as a kind of intermediate stage. As far as a broad-scale nuclear confrontation with the use of all weapons of extermination is concerned, it is by no means precluded but remains up to a certain time in reserve, as it were, as a means of pressure on the enemy.

At the start of the 1980's the United States embarked in practice on preparing the potential for waging such a war. At the last moment of his term in the White House J. Carter issued PD 59 (1980). It stipulated a number of new points. In particular, a more rigid orientation toward a disarming first strike was outlined. To deliver it it was proposed using not only strategic but also so-called "Eurostrategic" missiles, that is, American medium-range missiles deployed in West Europe.

In accordance with this document, the overall "limited nuclear war" scenario envisaged a sudden strike by strategic offensive forces, whose main purpose is destruction of the nuclear, primarily strategic, power of a "potential enemy" to deliver a retaliatory strike or, at least, to reduce the force thereof as much as possible.

In order to realize the set goals it is necessary, naturally, to have the corresponding potential capable of hitting targets with great accuracy. The arsenal of nuclear forces built for waging a global war is unsuitable for this. Such first-strike weapons began to be developed in the United States in the first half of the 1970's even in parallel with the theoretical study of the "limited nuclear war" concept. In the latter half of the 1970's these efforts continued at an ever increasing pace. The R. Reagan administration has imparted to them a truly unprecedented scale. Particular attention is being paid to such systems as that same MX intercontinental strategic missile, the Trident 2, the new MK-12a warhead, whose yield and accuracy of hit are double those of the previous MK-12 warhead, and cruise missiles. All these systems and also the Pershings deployed in West Europe are first-strike weapons.

The stockpiling of such "counterforce," as it is called in the United States, potential is presented by American military specialists as a method that has at last been found of extrication from the "deadlock" of nuclear parity and as an opportunity which has been acquired for the "realization" of nuclear war as a means of solving political problems. This is what R. Osgood, an

acknowledged transatlantic expert on U.S. current military strategy, writes in this connection in the book "Limited War Revisited": "The development of strategic arms of increased accuracy, their more flexible targeting and more reliable command--control--communications systems have secured new technical possibilities for making an exchange of strategic nuclear strikes a rational instrument of policy instead of an act of national suicide."*

And, indeed, could a "limited nuclear" war be more "rational" and humane than a general nuclear war: after all, it is not cities which are destroyed, only military targets, and the number of casualties would seemingly be reduced. But this could appear to be the case only at first sight and could deceive only those who themselves wish to be deceived.

First of all, what is meant by the damage from a "counterforce" war being "slight"? The majority of specialists agrees that if a nuclear duel were fought with jeweler's precision and affected only military targets, even in this case millions of people would die, considerable sectors of social life would be disorganized and the consequences of radiation would be catastrophic.

The main thing, however, is what follows: there are no guarantees that a nuclear war could be kept within a certain framework. On the contrary, there is every reason to assert that nuclear weapons, "unlimited" in their destructive essence, preclude a "limited" war. Unlimited in their power, delivery systems and the entirely unpredictable consequences to which their use could lead, nuclear weapons are assuming their own logic, which is incompatible with concepts of moderation and rationality. In this sense they represent a kind of culmination of the long evolution of armed forces and war itself as a social phenomenon, evolution from its relative rationality and relative controllability to insanity and complete uncontrollability.

In the nuclear age, when war embraces land, sea, air and space, when a nuclear strike can be delivered from any point on land and in the oceans and the stratosphere and at any target, wherever it may be, and when the entire world may be turned into the theater of military operations and people are being replaced at the panel controlling the military operations by electronic machinery, control over the weapons of annihilation is altogether slipping from man's hands.

Faced with these facts, one has to presume the unbelievable to believe in the possibility of "limited nuclear war". To persuade oneself that the means of devastation, which it was not before possible to keep in the arsenals, may in some unknown way be limited to theaters of military operations, when the world is already turning into chaos. To admit of the utterly illusory hope that politicians, who have not been able to agree among themselves to avoid war, may suddenly be capable of displaying commonsense and preventing it growing into a global level. Can it really, for example, be guaranteed that in the event of American imperialism losing a "counterforce," "limited" war it would not resort to even more powerful types of weapons?

* R. Osgood, "Limited War Revisited," Boulder, 1979, p 57.

And here is something else which is important to bear in mind: the very idea of a "small," "limited" nuclear war in any form, in a Blitzkrieg or protracted form, essentially leads to nothing other than the erasure of the boundary between conventional and nuclear war inasmuch as the so-called "nuclear threshold" is objectively lowered. The danger of a universal catastrophe thereby becomes more real.

The modern version of the "counterforce" strategy also leads to a lowering of the "nuclear threshold". For the very illusion that nuclear weapons may be employed effectively, without great losses, against an enemy's military targets and, in addition, reduce the possibility of a retaliatory concentrated strike is capable only of encouraging an aggressor.

It is impossible to keep nuclear war within a certain framework stipulated in advance. "Is it possible to seriously discuss," Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, observed in this connection, "some limited nuclear war? After all, it is clear to all that an aggressor's actions would inevitably and immediately bring about the annihilating retaliatory strike of the side subjected to the aggression. Only completely irresponsible people can claim that a nuclear war may be waged according to some rules drawn up in advance, in accordance with which nuclear missiles are to explode in "gentlemanly fashion": only over certain targets, not hitting the population here."*

Attempting to camouflage the aggressive essence of the proposition concerning the permissibility of nuclear war, American ruling circles interpret it in the spirit of the "restraint" concept. President Reagan and his closest advisers are developing this version virtually daily. In fact, however, the idea of "small," "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war perfectly obviously goes beyond the framework of restraint. Its aggressive essence is exposed primarily once again by the fact that it is a by no means retaliatory but precisely a first-strike strategy. The American scientist R. Aldridge observed perfectly reasonably in this connection in an article with the characteristic title "Decisive First Strike Concept": "The strategy of the choice primarily of military targets is called 'counterforce' strategy and is utterly unrelated to the principle of restraint. Its purpose is not to ensure nuclear deadlock or a 'balance of fear' but to prepare for the United States' delivery of a sudden strike. The superpower which is oriented to the strategic principle of 'counterforce' must strike first for otherwise its bombs will fall on empty missile silos. The attempts to conceal this strategy's orientation toward the delivery of a first strike are the greatest deception to which the American people have ever been subjected."

That the United States' new nuclear strategy is a first-strike strategy is not doubted by a single serious military specialist. At the same time none of them can have any doubt that militarily a first strike, even with superaccurate and supermodern "counterforce" potential, is the most complete

* PRAVDA, 25 July 1981.

absurdity. After all, it would be at least ridiculous to suppose that the side opposed to the United States would consent to some "rules of the game" beneficial only to the aggressor. And that a first strike would not be followed by a powerful counterstrike.

III

The very idea of nuclear war is giving rise to justified criticism on the part of many competent persons in the West, including the United States itself. After all, it would be simply improbable to assume that the "limited nuclear war" supporters in Washington do not take account of the simple truth that a hypothetical exchange of nuclear strikes (even if it is assumed for a moment that it would occur in the "limited" version of "counterforce" strategy) could have irreversible consequences for the United States itself. And it can hardly be doubted that it is this consideration which constitutes the main reason for the persistent efforts being made by the Reagan administration to make the arena of a potential nuclear war not the United States but the territory of other countries situated far from the United States. It would like to conduct matters such as to move the epicenter of nuclear war far away from the territory of the United States itself and transfer it to, say, Europe, the Indian Ocean region, the Far East or some other part of the world.

American strategists assign Europe the obvious priority in these plans. And it is understandable why. On the European continent the two most powerful military-political groupings of the present-day--the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact states--confront each other most directly in the sense that the demarcation line between them runs along national borders. Whence, as, evidently, the Pentagon believes, it is easiest to strike the most telling blow at the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries.

Guided by these motives, Washington is persistently endeavoring to move toward the borders of the Soviet Union and the European socialist countries the new medium-range weapons systems, which are intended for strategic assignments. The deployment of the American Pershing 2's and Tomahawks in the FRG and a number of other West European countries is aimed at a fundamental change in the strategic situation on the European continent to the detriment of the Warsaw Pact states.

Attempts are being made in NATO circles to pass this decision off as "rearmament" and "modernization" of the North Atlantic bloc's nuclear arsenal in the "European theater" allegedly in the face of the Warsaw Pact's military superiority. This is a deliberate lie. By the start of the 1980's an approximate balance had evolved between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries in Europe in the number of medium-range missiles--approximately 1,000 per side. Therefore the deployment of the new "Eurostrategic" missiles is aimed at a quantitative change in the balance of forces in Europe in favor of NATO.

The deployment of American ground-based nuclear missiles of great accuracy on the borders of the USSR and the European socialist countries means a qualitative change in the strategic situation in Europe. After all, resolving to launch intercontinental strategic missiles from U.S. territory which can

reach the target in 25-30 minutes, when the opposite side obviously has time to undertake a retaliatory launch of its own missiles and inflict on the aggressor "unacceptable damage," is one thing. Launching nuclear missiles from the territory of West Europe, when the flight time is put at 4-6 minutes, which, according to the calculations of American strategists, deprives a potential enemy of the opportunity of delivering a retaliatory strike, is another. Thus the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe is objectively aimed at the creation in this region of first, "preemptive" strike potential in this region which, in accordance with Pentagon intentions, could either force the USSR to accept American terms of capitulation or be the first act in a global nuclear war in which the initiative of the first strike and the advantages connected with it would from the outset be on the side of the United States.

The deployment on the European continent of the new American nuclear missiles is being presented in the form of a "new concept of the defense of West Europe." It is a question of the creation of a so-called component of NATO Joint Armed Forces in Europe--the "Eurostrategic nuclear forces". Together with the American "theater" nuclear forces (that is, U.S. forward-based nuclear forces deployed in the vicinity of the Warsaw Pact States) and its conventional armed forces stationed in Europe they are to constitute a modernized NATO "triad" which could respond to the tasks of waging a war confined to the European continent.

Inasmuch as the Soviet medium-range missiles do not reach U.S. territory, while the American missiles of this class deployed in West Europe are capable of striking vital centers in the Soviet Union (that is, are strategic weapons), the Pentagon is hoping to achieve its global aims at the expense of the European allies. In accordance with the version of a "limited war" "enclosed" within the geographical framework of Europe, military operations are to take place without the involvement of the United States' strategic nuclear forces, that is, so that the nuclear conflagration not affect the American continent.

In American special literature this is called "redistributing the degree of risk" within NATO and in mass propaganda is presented as "concern for the security" of West Europe. Motivated by these allegedly purely "altruistic" intentions, the United States is demonstrating truly boundless "generosity". It is stinting on nothing for its allies and is ready, not reckoning with the will of the peoples in the slightest, to impose increasingly new types of weapons on them.

In the name of West Europe's "security" Washington sought from Bonn, London and Rome consent to the deployment of the new American medium-range missiles. In the name of West Europe's "security" Washington intends to supply the NATO armed forces with neutron weapons. In the name of "security" Washington is contemplating making Europe once again a gas chamber. At the same time negotiations are under way on modernizing nonnuclear arms for the purpose of enhancing their yield and strike accuracy.

At the end of December 1982 these intentions acquired perfectly specific outlines in the form of the so-called "doctrine" of the American general B. Rogers, supreme commander NATO Joint Armed Forces in Europe. The "Rogers doctrine" proceeds from the possibility of fighting a long nonnuclear war using conventional weapons, but on condition of their appreciable reorganization. He by no means refers to the preparation of a nonnuclear war instead of a nuclear war here but regards it as a kind of supplement to the latter. General Rogers is demanding increased preparations for a "protracted war" with the use of "ultramodern electronic intelligence weapons" and new missiles with conventional, nonnuclear warheads, but with exceptionally high tactical-technical specifications capable of hitting the enemy forces "throughout the depth of their dispositions."

Need it be said that in this formulation of the question of "Rogers doctrine" may be regarded as no more than a further escalation of the arms race oriented toward a "limited" war in Europe which would give American imperialism the same result as a "victorious" general nuclear war. President Reagan's statement made back in October 1981 testifies that this version is viewed in Washington as perfectly possible and undoubtedly preferable (inasmuch as the United States could then seemingly avoid a strike altogether). "A situation could develop," he claimed, "of both sides exchanging strikes by tactical weapons against troop contingents on the battlefield without any of the big powers pressing the button"* (that is, the strategic missile firing button--V.K.). The "battlefield" in this case is the European continent. It has reached the point where the Pentagon is beginning to talk about how to give different ranking representatives of the American command greater freedom in respect of the use of all types of weapons (including nuclear and chemical) and in determining the targets of nuclear or chemical attack in the event of war.

But at this moment American geopoliticians' particular attention is attracted not only by Europe. This conclusion is confirmed by the Pentagon's "Airland Battle" doctrine. Its main innovation is that it presupposes an appreciable qualitative modernization of nonnuclear weapons and the first use of all possible means of arms (conventional, chemical, nuclear) not only in the European theater but everywhere in the world and in all parts of the world where NATO has "vitally important interests". Thus developing the doctrine of "limited nuclear war" and also of a war using nonnuclear weapons, American strategists are linking this with a stimulation of its military presence on the "periphery" also, that is, in the zone of the national liberation movement.

The wish is to instill in the American people that only armed with a "big stick" is the United States capable of preserving for itself the role of great power, and the future "battlefield" for America is the whole world. Even today the task is to secure for itself in the world as many strategically important points as possible and to build up its armed forces here. Believing that it is the developing countries which could cause American imperialism

* Quoted from "Whence the Threat to Peace," Moscow, 1982, p 14.

the biggest "trouble" in the future, U.S. ruling circles are of the opinion that military intervention in potential crisis situations over vast expanses of the developing world will be a basic direction of "power politics" in the 1980's.

The United States has had considerable practice here, as is known. U.S. Army subunits took part in military operations in Korea and Vietnam, Laos, Lebanon and the Dominican Republic and carried out an armed blockade of Cuba.... Nonetheless, up to a certain time Washington officials endeavored, albeit outwardly, to somehow distance themselves from direct acts of aggression and intervention. Even during the Vietnam war they adhered to the so-called "Nixon doctrine," which proceeds from the premise that, relying on reactionary regimes and arming them against their own peoples, it is possible to force "Asians to fight Asians" and "Africans to fight Africans" and for oneself to remain aloof, as it were.

However, the "Nixon doctrine" very quickly revealed its complete groundlessness. And subsequently, no longer relying on satellites, the United States has counted mainly on its own forces to "instill order". This does not mean, of course, that Washington is hereby abandoning, if only to some extent, its traditional backstage game in the so-called Third World. By no means. And it may be said with all certainty that if the United States had occupied a different position both globally and in respect of this specific situation or the other of our day, there would not have been the tragedy of Lebanon, the battle on the Falklands (Malvinas), the bloody days of El Salvador or the armed provocations in Southern Africa. It is not difficult to see behind the facade of all these dramatic events the imperial ambitions of the United States and an endeavor to take advantage of any destabilization of the situation in the world for accomplishing its own expansionist tasks.

But there is also no doubt that the main direction of American policy in respect of countries of the developing world now is one of direct military pressure. Direct aggression. A graphic example of which was Grenada. Mankind saw with its own eyes in the predatory U.S. act against this small country that where Reagan's America has a preponderance of strength, it will act as on Grenada--it will unceremoniously trample and stifle its victim, guided here by a single motive--its own hegemonist pretensions and nothing more.

Grenada was by no means an isolated phenomenon. And only a blind man could fail to spot the obvious interconnection of such events as the aggression against Grenada, the occupation of Lebanon, the CIA's undeclared war against Nicaragua, the deployment of American missiles in West Europe and so forth. On all meridians one and the same importunate trend--reliance on force and military superiority and the solution of all international problems by the armed path.

Where Washington has a chance to activate the guns, it does so unhesitatingly. Where, on the other hand, it cannot pursue "gunboat diplomacy," U.S. imperialism sets as its goal the achievement of military superiority in order to pursue from this position a policy of nuclear blackmail in the form of the threat of a "limited" or global war for the world according to Reagan is either America's patrimony or a graveyard beneath the ruins of a nuclear Armageddon.

Any versions of a "limited" nuclear or conventional, "Blitzkrieg" or "protracted" war come down to two basic postulates: first, making war in the nuclear age possible, second, bringing it as close to the borders of the Soviet Union as possible.

Both these premises ignore, however, the main thing, namely, that in our time any "local" conflict inevitably affects many "nerve centers" of world politics and entails the threat of growth into a universal catastrophe.

Whatever scenarios of a "limited nuclear war" are being concocted in the Pentagon, whatever versions are elaborated, none of them will be anything other than a variety of global catastrophe. At the current level of development of the production forces, science and technology there is one sole practicable solution of the problem of international security: no war.

Addressing the voters of Moscow's Kuybyshev Electoral Okrug on 2 March 1984, K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, called on leaders of the powers possessing nuclear weapons to subordinate relations between these powers to certain rules common for all and formulated their basic content. Among the points of fundamental importance the proposition: "Renounce propaganda of nuclear war in any version thereof--global or limited"*--was highlighted. This proposition is again confirmed by the constancy of the position of the CPSU and the Soviet state: nuclear war cannot be allowed--neither small, big, limited nor total.

This is the command of our time.

The nuclear age has made very considerable adjustments to the concept of national and international security. The traditional approaches of the past are no longer any good. Whereas previously it was believed that military superiority was a reliable guarantee of national security, it is now becoming increasingly obvious that even the most colossal arms potential is incapable in itself of guaranteeing it. Whereas previously national security could with certain justification have been viewed in a regional plane, it is now acquiring a world scale. In our time, in the face of the threat of nuclear war, relations between all states must be weighed to the utmost and their interests reciprocally considered, primarily from the standpoints of national security and the security of all mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

* PRAVDA, 3 March 1984.

U.S. 'GUNBOAT DIPLOMACY' IN LEBANON, SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4,
Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 51-63

[Article by O. Kovtunovich, V. Nosenko: "The Near East--Imperialism's Power Politics in Action"]

[Text] The tension that has existed in the Near East for several decades not only is not abating but is assuming an increasingly dramatic and explosive nature. The tragedy of the Palestinian Arab people continues. Israel has engaged in unconcealed genocide against the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. On the Arab land captured in 1967 it is pursuing a policy of strict terror against the indigenous population and intensively building its militarized settlements here, preparing for the direct annexation of this territory.

The framework of the Arab-Israeli conflict has expanded considerably: a sovereign Arab state--Lebanon--has become a new victim of aggression. Throughout the 1970's this country was repeatedly subjected to armed attacks on the part of Israel, and in the summer of 1982 the Tel Aviv military, having perpetrated large-scale aggression against Lebanon, captured a considerable proportion of its territory. In the wake of the Israeli occupiers Lebanese soil was invaded by military subunits of the United States and a number of its NATO allies under the fraudulent sign of "multinational force" committed allegedly to ensure Lebanon's "security". In practice the true purpose of this interventionist force was by no means to ensure Lebanon's security but to kindle intercommunal strife in the country in order to weaken the Lebanese national-patriotic forces and the Palestinian movement, which are putting up courageous resistance to the imperialist intervention. Although the interventionists have been forced to pull out of Beirut, an armada of U.S. ships in full combat readiness remains off Lebanon's shores, demonstrating Washington's adherence to "battleship diplomacy".

Thus the United States is not confining itself to the role of Israel's backstage partner in aggression, it has committed its own armed forces to the Near East in an attempt to realize its own imperial designs here. Instead of a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, American policy is leading to a further exacerbation of the situation in the region and the continuation of the constant threat to the security of the peoples of this region and universal peace.

Washington's Near East strategy is inseparably linked with the global adventurist militarist policy of the White House. "...Recent years," K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized, "have been marked by a sharp stimulation of the policy of the most aggressive circles of American imperialism--a policy of avowed militarism, claims to world domination, resistance to progress and violation of the rights and liberties of the peoples. The world has seen many examples of its practical application." In the Near East, which the United States has arbitrarily declared a zone of its "vitally important interests," it is attempting to break the resistance of the anti-imperialist forces and establish its hegemony there. The main local strong point of this imperial policy is Israel, the expansionist appetites of whose ruling upper stratum Washington is actively taking advantage of for striking at the national liberation movement in the region.

The artificially created "power" of Israel no longer appears to its transatlantic patrons sufficient for the realization of their designs and is being underpinned by the expansion of the direct U.S. military presence in this part of the world. American naval formations have acquired a permanent "residence permit" in the East Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf zone. Washington is persistently seeking the creation in a number of Arab countries of its military bases and also weapons dumps which in the event of crisis situations will be used by the "rapid deployment force" as strong points for conducting large-scale military operations. American military subunits have already conducted joint maneuvers with the armies of Egypt and Sudan. In January 1983 Washington created the special Central Command (Centcom), to which the American "rapid deployment force" intended for the Near East was assigned. The creation of this body represented a step in the direction of the United States' direct military intervention over a vast expanse embracing the territory of 19 states of the region.

Extensive opportunities in this respect are also afforded the United States by the agreement on political, strategic and economic cooperation which was made official during Israeli Prime Minister Y. Shamir's visit to Washington at the end of November 1983. This document is absolutely openly aimed at assigning Israel the role of local "power center" coordinating its actions with the United States, primarily in the military sphere.

A new step of the United States in the buildup of military potential in the Near East was the deployment as part of the "multinational force" of American troops on the Sinai peninsula and in Lebanon. Furthermore, Washington is working out a system of including its NATO allies in the realization of its own aggressive plans. The mere fact of the formation of such a force represents an attempt to create an "international" mechanism controlled by the United States with which it could operate in its own interests both in the Near East and in other parts of the world, in circumvention of the corresponding UN mechanism.

The recent events in Lebanon have also laid bare other extremely dangerous trends in present American policy. It has become perfectly obvious that the R. Reagan administration regards participation in the "multinational force" as a pretext for a military presence in the region which is highly desirable for itself. Thus the American contingent in Beirut numbered 1,800 men, but in the roads in the vicinity of the Lebanese capital allegedly for ensuring the security of this contingent there is permanently a considerable number of ships of forces of the U.S. 6th Fleet, including aircraft carriers, on board which are several thousand marines who are ready to be put ashore at any moment. Having joined directly in suppression of the progressive, anti-imperialist forces in the Near East by the armed path, the R. Reagan administration is attempting to conceal its actions with the thoroughly fraudulent slogan of the "Soviet threat" in the region.

With regard for the fact that Washington is at the present time openly elevating the use of armed actions against sovereign states to the level of official policy, there is apprehension concerning the possibility of aggression by the United States in alliance with Israel against Syria, which is at the forward edge of the anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist struggle in the Near East. The adventurist policy of the United States is essentially bringing matters to the point of the Arab-Israeli conflict not only developing into a new acute crisis phase but also going beyond the framework of the region and thereby creating a threat to universal peace.

II

The change in the United States' Near East policy "legalizing" the use of force has not occurred in a void and, strictly speaking, is not distinguished by particular novelty. It is rather a question of a shift of accents to power methods, which have by no means been alien to American policy previously. This change began to manifest itself particularly distinctly after H. Kissinger's "shuttle diplomacy," which was aimed at achieving separate agreements between Israel and the Arab countries, had begun to skid in the mid-1970's and at the end of this decade the attempts to include other--besides Egypt--participants in the Near East conflict in implementation of the capitulationist Camp David deal and compel them to follow the example of the as-Sadat regime had failed.

The serious obstacles in the way of a Near East settlement which arose through the fault of American diplomacy undermined Washington's prestige in the Arab world, among the conservative regimes included. The United States' influence in the region was also considerably weakened at that time in connection with the revolution in Iran, which was of an anti-imperialist nature. Endeavoring to compensate for the manifest failures in its policy in the Near East, the J. Carter administration resolved to resort to a show of strength in the hope of restoring the shaken American positions there.

At the start of 1979 Z. Brzezinski, the U.S. President's national security adviser, advanced a concept whose essence was that a number of countries of the Horn of Africa and the Near and Middle East are allegedly distinguished by a high degree of internal instability. On the pretext of warding off the mythical "Soviet threat" the concept substantiated the need for an American military presence in this vast region, which had acquired the name "arc of

crisis". Particular significance in the region was attached to the Persian Gulf zone with its huge oil reserves. It was here that large subunits of U.S. warships with marines on board were sent. In 1979 Washington began to form at an accelerated pace the "rapid deployment force," which underwent special training for conducting military operations under Near and Middle East conditions. It was planned in 1980 even to increase the strength of these formations to 200,000 men.

In his annual report to Congress in January 1980 J. Carter advanced the notorious doctrine which declared the Persian Gulf a zone of the United States' "vitally important interests". Essentially Washington arbitrarily arrogated to itself the right to interfere in the internal affairs of a number of sovereign states many thousands of kilometers from the United States. The central place in the "Carter doctrine" was occupied by plans to transfer American military units to the Persian Gulf, create military bases in this zone and also build up the United States' naval presence in the Indian Ocean. However, the Arabs adopted an extremely negative attitude toward the idea of the creation of foreign bases on their territory, rightly evaluating it as a relapse into imperial policy. The biggest country of the Arabian peninsula--Saudi Arabia--and, following it, the majority of Arab Gulf states also, despite their traditionally close relations with the United States, refused to consent to an infringement of their sovereignty. Nonetheless, the White House did succeed in creating on the territory of some countries weapons dumps and equipment for the "rapid deployment force". Thus the foundation for the deployment of U.S. interventionist forces in the Near East was laid back at the time of the previous U.S. Administration.

Elected to the presidency in 1980, R. Reagan shifted the center of gravity in Washington's global strategy to the military-force aspects and openly adopted a policy aimed at frustrating the process of the relaxation of international tension. An important place in this strategy was assigned the Near East region. The White House was candid enough in declaring its intention of, first, enhancing Israel's role in American regional policy and, second, sharply toughening the U.S. position in respect of local progressive forces, primarily the PLO. A document adopted by the Republican Party Convention on 15 July 1980 in Detroit and which reflected R. Reagan's election platform further declared: "The sovereignty, security and integrity of the state of Israel are a moral imperative and serve the strategic interests of the United States. Republicans confirm their fundamental and permanent allegiance to this principle. We will continue to make good our national commitments by means of political, economic, diplomatic and military assistance. We fully recognize Israel's strategic significance...."* As far as the problems of a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict are concerned, this document proclaimed as the main goal of American policy the achievement of a "just and lasting peace." The events of subsequent years, which have brought the peoples of the Near East so many casualties and such devastation, have demonstrated to the whole world the true value of this hypocritical rhetoric.

The situation in the Near East by the time of the change of guard in the White House remained extremely tense as a result of American diplomacy's attempts to achieve a "settlement" on the basis of the Camp David plan.

* FOCUS, 1 August 1980, p 3.

By 26 May 1980, that is, by the officially scheduled date of the completion of the negotiations on so-called "Palestinian autonomy," the parties to the separate deal--the United States, Israel and Egypt--had been unable to achieve any results. Under conditions where the "Camp David process" had made increasingly remote the prospect of the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Near East, the aggressiveness of Israel's policy was growing constantly. A striking demonstration of this was the Begin government's proclamation in August 1980 of a "united" Jerusalem as the "eternal capital" of Israel.

However, it was not only and not so much the situation that had taken shape in the Near East which prompted the new White House administration to attempts to circumvent the process of an all-embracing settlement. The main thing for Washington were considerations of a global nature, namely: the intention to incorporate the states of this region in the strict confrontation with the Soviet Union which was being developed by the United States.

In the course of a visit to a number of Near East countries in April 1981 then U.S. Secretary of State A. Haig persistently attempted to instill in the leaders of conservative Arab regimes that the main danger for the region was represented by the alleged "Soviet threat" and that therefore they should push their conflict with Israel into the background in order to join together with it in a bloc of anti-Soviet and anticommunist forces--the so-called "strategic consensus"--being knocked together by Washington. Whereas Israel and as-Sadat's Egypt supported this idea, the other Arab countries rejected it, giving as the reason for their position the fact that the real danger for the Arab world was represented by the policy of the Tel Aviv, and some "accord" with it without a just settlement of the Near East conflict was impossible. They emphasized particularly here the need for consideration of the Palestinian factor.

At that time, availing itself of the strengthening pro-Israel sentiments in Washington which were discerned distinctly after R. Reagan had taken over the White House, the Begin government engaged throughout 1981 in a new series of aggressive actions. In the spring of that same year Israeli aircraft made a number of provocative attacks against Syrian troops in Lebanon, who are there at the decision of the Arab League as part of the "inter-Arab force". In June 1981 the Tel Aviv military carried out a bandit sally against Iraq, destroying in the course of the air raid the atomic reactor near Baghdad, at which, according to an IAEA commission, there were no signs of the production of raw material for military purposes. A month later densely populated areas of Beirut were subjected to barbaric bombing, and then for more than 2 weeks the Israeli Army conducted large-scale military operations in South Lebanon against PLO detachments and Lebanese national-patriotic forces. It is indicative that both during the raid on the Baghdad reactor and during the Beirut bombing Israel employed F-15 and F-16 aircraft which it had received from across the ocean.

Although it failed to achieve a "strategic consensus," the R. Reagan administration did not abandon plans for the militarization of Near East countries and their involvement in kinds of informal blocs. In the fall of 1981 the American "rapid deployment force" conducted the Bright Star maneuvers together with the armies of Egypt, Sudan, Oman and Somalia. Washington was

manifestly hastening with the aid of these maneuvers to demonstrate the United States' military presence in the region and thereby emphasize its intention of keeping Egypt in the stream of its Near East policy following the assassination of President as-Sadat.

The U.S. Congress' approval on 29 October 1981 of the sale to Saudi Arabia of five aircraft with an onboard warning and guidance system (AWACS) for a sum of \$8.5 billion also corresponded to the plans for militarization of the region. The terms of the deal were worded such that the use of the AWACS was to serve not so much the defense purpose of Saudi Arabia as to secure for the United States intelligence information concerning the armies of Arab states.

Israel's ruling circles and international Zionist organizations initiated a noisy campaign against this deal, and certain Western information organs also evaluated it as evidence of the United States' departure from the traditional policy of maintaining "special relations" with Tel Aviv. This show corresponded fully to Washington's interests inasmuch as one of its purposes in the deal was to create the appearance of the United States' "balanced" approach to both sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict. However, the first months of the new U.S. Administration's term in office even showed as clearly as could be that Israel's role in the United States' Near East policy had increased sharply. The antimonarchical revolution in Iran, the Arab states' negative reaction to the idea of a "strategic consensus" and the removal from the political arena of Egypt's President as-Sadat were perceived by Washington as new confirmation that Tel Aviv was its most dependable ally in the Near East. The conclusions were not slow to follow: military assistance to Israel increased, and, what is most important, there was increased U.S. support for its expansionist policy.

The Begin government took advantage of the patronage of the R. Reagan administration to step up the pace of preparations for annexation of the Arab territory occupied in 1967. Together with the intensive building of settlements and the confiscation of land from the Arabs new steps were taken to consolidate the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Endeavoring to impart "outward respectability" to the occupation regime on these territories, in November 1981 Tel Aviv played out the farce of the transition from a military to civilian administration: the occupiers changed military uniforms for civilian attire. Simultaneously repression against the local patriotic forces was stepped up. In the spring of 1982 the occupation authorities replaced many West Bank mayors, and some of them fell victim to Zionists' terrorist acts. In March-April 1982 the Israeli military put down a mass uprising of residents of the West Bank with extreme cruelty.

Despite the fact that the Arab countries openly made the United States responsible for the escalation of Israeli aggressiveness, the R. Reagan administration not only did not attempt to moderate the zeal of its "partner" but essentially encouraged it to new anti-Arab actions. This was manifested particularly distinctly in connection with the "Memorandum of Mutual Understanding Between the United States and Israel in the Sphere of Strategic Cooperation" which came to light in November 1981. The signing of the memorandum had been preceded by talks between Begin and Reagan in Washington,

in the course of which the sides reached agreement on a broad range of questions of "strategic cooperation". The problem of military cooperation was the main one on the agenda of their meeting. The United States underlined its commitment to build two air bases in the Negev for Israel as compensation for the Eitom and Etzion bases in Sinai which it had to leave in April 1982 in connection of the return of the peninsula to Egypt. Washington reserved for itself here the right to avail itself of the bases in the Negev. The memorandum provided for the planning and holding of joint maneuvers, the storing of American weapons on Israeli territory and an expansion of the volume of military supplies to Tel Aviv. Having signed this document, the R. Reagan administration officially proclaimed Israel its main ally in the Near East.

III

Tel Aviv perceived the "strategic cooperation" memorandum with Washington as a kind of carte blanche for continuation of the expansionist policy. In December 1981 even the Begin government extended Israeli legislation to the Golan Heights, which had been captured from Syria, which meant the actual annexation of these territories. The explosion of indignation in the Arab world caused by this unlawful act was so powerful that the White House, for the sake of salvaging its prestige in the region, was forced to declare the memorandum which had only just been signed "frozen". However, this step, as subsequent events showed, was of a purely formal nature. The cooperation of the "strategic partners" not only continued but assumed even greater proportions, serving as the source of a new tragedy for the Near East.

At the start of 1982 Israel began to prepare openly for aggression against Lebanon. The Reagan administration adopted an "understanding" attitude toward its partner's preparation of the latest adventure, hoping that it would create a situation in the region more conducive to the realization of American strategic designs. In fact the United States gave Tel Aviv the go-ahead for aggression in Lebanon during the visit to Washington in May 1982 of Sharon, who was at that time defense minister in the Begin cabinet. The White House believed that Israel would succeed in smashing the PLO and seriously weakening Syria in the course of a strike against its military contingent in Lebanon. Given this version of events, the forces operating in the vanguard of the Arab peoples' struggle against imperialism and Zionism would prove to have been "neutralized". The R. Reagan administration hoped that the conditions would thereby be created for a galvanization of the "Camp David process". It was counting here, first, on the assumption of power in Lebanon of a rightwing Christian government capable of signing a separate "peace" with Israel and, second, a weakening of the general Arab resistance to the American plan for a "settlement".

A central place in Washington's designs was occupied by hopes that Tel Aviv's Lebanon adventure would afford a prospect of the United States' expanded military presence in the Near East, most likely in the form of a contingent consisting of a "multinational force" sent in allegedly for the purpose of disengaging the combatants and ensuring Lebanon's security. The stationing

in Sinai in the wake of the withdrawal therefrom of Israeli forces in April 1983 of a "multinational force" of a total strength of 2,500 men, 1,200 of whom are American soldiers, was to have served as the precedent for this. It is highly indicative that the U.S. contingent in Sinai was formed from subunits of the "rapid deployment force" and deployed at strategically important points--on the island of Tiran at the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba and around Sharm ash-Shaykh.

From the first days of the invasion of Lebanon Tel Aviv relied on the broad political support of Washington, which attempted to portray the far-reaching aggression as a forced action of Israel's undertaken by the latter to ensure the "security" of its northern borders.* The fact that the PLO had observed unswervingly the cease-fire agreement reached in July 1981 and had not launched a single operation from Lebanese territory for 11 months was deliberately ignored here. Israel did not confine itself to concentrating troops close to the border with Lebanon but also made a number of attacks on this country (including the barbaric bombing of Beirut of 21 April 1981) as of the spring of 1981. All this was aimed at provoking the PLO to retaliatory operations and, having accused it of violating the cease-fire agreement, thereby acquiring the desired pretext for the start of the new military adventure.

During the aggression itself the United States exerted the maximum effort to neutralize the protests of the international public and ensure for its partner conditions conducive to the achievement in Lebanon of goals in which both Washington and Tel Aviv were interested. Availing itself of its veto in the UN Security Council, the United States vetoes a resolution demanding an end to military operations and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory.

Despite the fact that Israel had thrown a more than 100,000-strong army equipped with the latest weapons into Lebanon, it did not succeed, as it had hoped, in smashing the PLO subunits with a lightning strike and completing the "operation" as quickly as possible. From the first days the aggressor encountered the stubborn resistance of the Palestinians and Lebanese national-patriotic forces and, instead of a Blitzkrieg, it had to wage a long war, which was attended by considerable losses. Israel was unable either to wipe out or discredit the PLO. The attempts to strike a "crushing" blow at Syria on Lebanese territory were also unsuccessful.

Although the American-Israeli strategic goals remained identical, at the same time tactical disagreements were revealed between Washington and Tel Aviv in the course of the aggression. This applied to the Begin government's intentions of annexing areas of South Lebanon and "settling the Palestinian problem" by way of driving the Palestinians out of Lebanon and, possibly, striking subsequently at Jordan. Implementation of these intentions could have seriously complicated the United States' position in the Near East and completely undermined its relations with the conservative regimes.

* The Begin government hypocritically christened its aggressive action against Lebanon "Peace for Galilee" (the northern parts of Israel).

Under these conditions Washington was forced to undertake a diplomatic action which might blunt the outburst of Arab anger at the events which had taken place and contribute to the restoration of American prestige in the region. Furthermore, the White House assumed that as a result of the Lebanese war a situation had taken shape conducive to the advancement of the American plan for a "settlement" of the Near East conflict. Hopes were built here on the fact that the anti-imperialist forces of the Arab world, primarily Syria and the PLO, had been weakened and would not be able to counteract the United States. The R. Reagan administration hoped that in putting forward the new "peace" plan it would be able to monopolize the settlement process and remove the Soviet Union from it. Washington also counted on expanding the opportunities for maneuver in the Arab world in order subsequently to return to the plans for involving certain Arab regimes in the orbit of the strict global confrontation with the USSR being developed by the United States.

All these considerations determined the appearance on 1 September 1982 of a new American "initiative"--the "Reagan Plan". From the viewpoint of the general American approach to conflict situations this "initiative" signified Washington's return to the idea of the settlement of the Near East conflict whereby the United States exclusively would dictate its terms. Endeavoring to create the appearance of "distancing itself" from the utterly candid Israeli policy of expansion and aggression, the White House included in its plan very modest hints at disagreement, first, with the annexationist designs of the Begin government and, second, with the unlimited building of Israeli settlements on occupied Arab territory.

As far as the American "prescriptions" for a solution of the Palestinian problem were concerned, they were not distinguished by novelty and were formulated with regard primarily for the interests of Tel Aviv. The basis of the "solution" contained in the plan was the idea of the "association of the West Bank and Gaza with Jordan," which had been put forward prior to Reagan entering the White House. Essentially this idea was nothing other than a conditional formula adopted by American diplomacy to camouflage a refusal to satisfy the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to create their own independent state. It is highly indicative that the "Reagan Plan" lacks even a mention of the PLO. The "plan's" anti-Arab emphasis is also manifested distinctly in the indications of the need to provide in the future for Israel's ties to the West Bank and the preservation of the militarized settlements which already exist.

The pro-Israel thrust of the "Reagan Plan" determined the negative attitude toward it of the majority of Arab states and the PLO. Washington's hopes of uncoupling the Arab world and, accordingly, winning Arab's approval for its "peace" plan proved groundless also. The pan-Arab summit in Fez at the start of September 1982 confirmed the closeness of the Arab states' opinions on a whole number of vitally important issues, primarily concerning ways to normalize the situation in the region. The plan for a settlement of the Near East conflict approved by all those taking part in the meetings was a constructive alternative to the American "peace" plan. The very adoption thereof literally a few days after the appearance of the "Reagan Plan" was a kind of Pan-Arab response to Washington for its new "initiative".

Demonstrating its "equality" in the alliance existing between it and the United States, Israel opposed the "Reagan Plan" inasmuch as this document created the appearance of the possibility of Arab sovereignty over the West Bank and Gaza and was contrary to the policy of the Begin government of the unlimited building of new settlements. In connection with Washington's diplomatic maneuvers of the fall of 1982 Tel Aviv noticeably stepped up its efforts to expand the network of settlements on the occupied territory, endeavoring thus to block the prospect of any solution unsuitable to it. The American TIME magazine noted without sarcasm that "the more President Reagan expressed discontent at the new settlements on the West Bank, the more quickly the Israelis built them."* Israel was able to pursue such a policy solely thanks to the fact that the American declarations remained empty phrases unsupported by any practical steps. Furthermore, to please his "strategic partner" President Reagan subsequently even removed clauses of his plan which irritated Israel and now declared that the Israeli settlements "are not an obstacle to peace."

Israel's ruling circles acknowledge with cynical candor that the policy of colonization of the captured Arab territory which they are pursuing is aimed at changing the demographic composition of the population. This is intended, according to their calculations, to open a prospect for annexation based on a fait accompli. Of the approximately 140 Israeli militarized settlements, 71 were built following the conclusion of the Camp David agreements. It is planned to have built a further 57 settlements by 1987. Up to 30,000 Israelis are currently living on the West Bank and in Gaza. Plans for the future provide for an increase in the number of settlers to 1.3 million.** The policy of terror against the indigenous population of these territories which is openly being pursued by the Israeli authorities is also subordinated to the goals of preparing the conditions for annexation of the occupied territories. The killing of peaceful Palestinian inhabitants, bestial reprisals and unwarranted arrests have become a daily occurrence here. As a rule, the crimes of the Zionist extremists against the Arabs go unpunished. The British magazine MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL wrote in this connection: "Even Israeli liberals are now beginning to ask themselves whether the Israeli establishment wishes to pursue the criminals perpetrating crimes against the Arabs."***

In Israel itself the aggressive, expansionist policy of its rulers is causing the growing discontent of broad strata of the population. An explosion of antiwar sentiments was caused by the Begin government's adventure in Lebanon. A 400,000-strong demonstration, which was unprecedented in terms of the number of participants, took place in September 1982 in Tel Aviv demanding an end to the aggression and a thorough investigation of the massacre of Palestinians in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps which had been organized by the Israeli military. The Peace Now movement, which has been in existence since 1978, stepped up its activity noticeably. A whole number of new antiwar organizations arose. For the first time in Israel's history soldiers and officers began to join in the protests against the government's aggressive policy, and they even formed their own organization--There Is a Limit--and a number of others, which are participating actively in the antiwar movement.

* TIME, 21 February 1983, p 15.

** See LE MONDE, 12 April 1983.

*** MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL, 5 August 1983, p 8.

The Lebanon adventure has cost the country more than \$1 billion, sharply exacerbating Israel's already grave economic situation. In 1983 total military spending, including expenditure on maintaining an army of occupation in Lebanon, constituted two-thirds of the budget and the level of inflation reached the record mark of 190 percent, and in 1984 could reach, according to the estimates of Israeli economists, 280 percent. The balance of trade deficit last year amounted to \$5.35 billion, while the country's total foreign debt amounted to \$28 billion. In attempts to overcome the acute economic crisis Israeli Finance Minister Y. Cohen-Orgad presented in December 1983 a plan for a reduction in budget appropriations of \$1 billion at the expense primarily of spending not on the army and the colonization of the occupied territories but on education and social needs. As a result of this policy the number of Israelis living below the "official poverty level" has reached half a million. A strike movement has been growing in the country recently. Full, partial and warning strikes have occurred in the ministries of defense and the interior even. Fleeing the economic crisis, an increasingly large number of Israelis is quitting the "Zionist paradise". As the London TIMES believes, an even greater number of its citizens (compared with last year)--up to 100,000--will emigrate from Israel in 1984.

Endeavoring to prevent the economic collapse of its "strategic partner," Washington is increasing the amount of financial aid to Israel. Since 1948 the United States has granted it more than \$25 billion. In 1984 the amount of American assistance will constitute \$2.61 billion, including \$1.7 billion in the form of military credit.

IV

American diplomacy deferred implementation of the "Reagan Plan" until the solution of the "Lebanese problem," hoping that a settlement of the situation in Lebanon on American terms would create favorable conditions for the advancement of this "plan". President Reagan's personal representative, P. Habib, who throughout the first months of 1983 persistently attempted to incline the Lebanese Government toward reaching an accord which would be primarily to Israel's liking, was sent to the Near East.

U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz arrived in the Near East in May 1983 with the task of speeding up the achievement of a "peace treaty" between Lebanon and Israel. Such an agreement was signed shortly after. It formally declared an end to the state of war between the two countries. In accordance with its terms, it was proposed creating a 45-kilometer "security zone" in South Lebanon which would provide for an Israeli military presence. The agreement stipulated the banning of anti-Israel propaganda by the Lebanese mass media. The terms of the agreement seriously infringed Lebanon's sovereignty and its natural relations with the Arab world inasmuch as they required of it a renunciation of the treaties concluded within the Arab League framework, primarily the Arab Defense Pact. The agreement in fact presupposed the establishment of an Israeli protectorate over Lebanon and the strengthening of Tel Aviv's positions in this country, which created a serious threat to Syria's security. It has to be stressed that this agreement represented in practice a substitution of the corresponding UN decisions concerning a normalization of the situation in Lebanon and demanding the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor's forces.

Simultaneously with the Israeli-Lebanese "peace treaty" a secret agreement was signed between the United States and Israel in accordance with which, according to reports which were leaked to the press, Tel Aviv obtained freedom of maneuver for new aggressive actions on Lebanese territory, while the United States once again undertook not to conduct any negotiations with the PLO and to lift its "objections" to new Israeli settlements on the occupied territories. Israel was also granted the American licenses necessary for producing the multipurpose Lavi fighter bomber. The United States lifted the "embargo" on the supply of 75 F-16 fighter bombers to Tel Aviv.

The Israeli-Lebanese agreement was rejected by many national and religious groups of Lebanon's population, parties and organizations. It exacerbated even further the domestic political situation in the country. The emphasis on preservation of the dominant positions in Lebanon's political structures of the rightwing Christians caused the sharp discontent of other religious and ethnic groups of the population, whose political rights were infringed. The seriousness of the situation was intensified by the fact that Israel was absolutely not about to withdraw its occupying forces from Lebanon and had already begun the active assimilation of the south of the country. Shortly after the signing of the agreement, Israeli forces were redeployed from the Chouf mountain region to the line of the Awali River, but this was done in connection with the fact that they were sustaining heavy losses there as a result of the guerrilla operations. Tel Aviv, in unison with Washington, subsequently used the troop redeployment to further incite intercommunal discord and to strike at Lebanon's national-patriotic forces.

Not having achieved results either in a Lebanon settlement or in advancement of the "Reagan Plan," the White House again put the emphasis on power methods in its Near East policy. The American forces in Lebanon and the ships of the U.S. Navy plying this country's territorial waters began to coordinate their operations directly with the Israeli army of occupation. They joined actively in military operations against Lebanon's national-patriotic forces and Syrian troops. The original length of the U.S. marines' stay in Lebanon was put at "30 days". It was then extended to "18 months," which attested Washington's endeavor to transfer their presence here to a permanent footing. Within the framework of its tough policy the R. Reagan administration stepped up the military pressure on the Syrian forces on Lebanese territory, pushing Tel Aviv toward war with Syria. Former Israeli Foreign Minister A. Eban acknowledged that the "American friends" advised Israel in every possible way to start a real war with Syria.* American aircraft and long-range artillery continued the bombing and shelling of the positions of Syrian troops and detachments of Lebanon's national-patriotic forces. The number of casualties among the peaceful population grew, and many centers of population were turned into ruins.

The escalation of the American forces' military operations was not fortuitously connected with the negotiations which Shamir, the present Israeli prime minister, conducted at the end of November 1983 in the White House. An understanding providing for the onset of a "new era" in American-Israeli relations and even closer military-strategic cooperation was essentially made officials in the course of his visit. The creation on a permanent basis of a military-political committee of representatives of the two countries which would undertake the planning and staging of joint maneuvers, the deployment and

* See THE JERUSALEM POST INTERNATIONAL, 6-12 November 1983.

stockpiling of American weapons and equipment on Israeli territory and an exchange of intelligence data was contemplated. The sides agreed on the U.S. Navy's use of Israeli ports and also on the granting of the most modern offensive weapons to Tel Aviv.

The results of Shamir's talks in Washington were evaluated throughout the world, in the Arab countries included, unequivocally: the United States had conclusively and irreversibly thrown off the mask of "peacemaker" allegedly attempting to pursue a "balanced" policy between Israel and the Arabs. The agreement which was reached was not simply a galvanization of the memorandum of 30 November 1981; the cooperation and coordination of the operations of the two countries were henceforward raised to a new, higher level.

This change in U.S. policy was not fortuitous but had been long in preparation. First Washington, together with Tel Aviv, under the cover of American "peace" efforts and initiatives frustrated the convening of a Geneva conference on a Near East settlement and blocked the search for ways of a just solution of the conflict. With the help of the separate Camp David deal the biggest Arab country--Egypt--was withdrawn from the pan-Arab confrontation with Israel, which took advantage of this situation to attack Lebanon. U.S. troops appeared in Sinai and subsequently in Lebanon. The Iran-Iraq war, in the course of which the two states' human and natural resources are being insanely squandered, deepened even more the rift between the Arab countries and contributed to the further destabilization of the situation in the Near East.

The new accords between Washington and Tel Aviv promise the Arab peoples increased U.S. interference in the affairs of the region and an escalation of the Israeli policy of aggression and expansionism with America's active support and participation. The real threat hanging over the Arab world demands the surmounting of inter-Arab conflicts and the cohesion and close cooperation of the forces opposed to aggression.

The intrigues of imperialism aimed at undermining the cohesion of the ranks of the PLO in order to deprive it of the status of sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and ultimately remove it from the Near East political arena, which were stepped up following the Israeli aggression in Lebanon, also represent a serious danger. Recently reaction has been concentrating its efforts on imposing the "Reagan Plan" on the Palestinians and, correspondingly, compelling them to capitulate to the Zionist aggressors.

The courageous struggle of the Lebanese patriots and Syria's stanchness are creating serious obstacles in the way of realization of the American-Israeli designs in respect of the region. The U.S. marines had to relocate to the warships off Lebanon's coast. On 4 March 1984 Beirut abrogated the "peace agreement" with Israel which had been foisted on it last year. All Lebanese political forces, with the exception of the far right Christian groupings, and the Arab world approved the renunciation of this crippling agreement. American imperialism has suffered a serious defeat in the Near East. However, Washington and Tel Aviv, as their operations in Lebanon have shown, have not learned the proper lessons from these events. American naval assault forces remain off the coast of the sovereign Arab country and, judging by statements from the

White House, intend to continue to interfere in its internal affairs. The Israeli interventionists are threatening to expand their aggressive operations and are not contemplating withdrawing from occupied South Lebanon.

The hegemonist policy of the United States is opposed by that of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries, which advocate a just solution of the Near East problem in the interests of all states and peoples of the region. The USSR consistently supports the sovereignty, independence and unity of Lebanon and advocates a settlement of domestic political disagreements by way of the peaceful dialogue of the various sides, without the military-political interference of the United States and its closest NATO allies, and unconditional fulfillment of UN resolutions demanding the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory. The Soviet Union invariably supports the Syrian Arab Republic, which is opposing the intrigues in the region of the forces of imperialism and Zionism. As emphasized in the Soviet-Syrian communique on the results of a working visit to the Syrian Arab Republic by G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, "The Soviet Union values highly Syria's consistent position in Near East affairs and its effective contribution to counteracting the American-Israeli attempts to compel the Arab peoples to adopt crippling terms of a settlement and take the path of separate deals." The Palestinian people's courageous struggle for their legitimate rights has won Soviet people's profound sympathies. "The realization of the Palestinians' national aspirations," the communique goes on to say, "is impossible without observance of the decisions of the Palestine National Council aimed at counteracting Israeli aggression and the Camp David policy of separate deals, including the 'Reagan Plan,' and without the PLO's close cooperation with Syria and all progressive Arab states and patriotic forces of the Arab world."

The USSR believes that a lasting, just peace in the Near East may be achieved only on condition of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territory occupied in 1967, realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including the right to form their own state, and the secure and independent existence and development of all states of the region. The Soviet Union has also proposed the mechanism for such an all-embracing settlement--the convening of a special international conference on the Near East with the participation of all interested parties.

The Soviet proposals have been broadly supported throughout the world, particularly at the International Conference on Realization of the Inalienable Rights of the Arab People of Palestine which was held in Geneva last year. The UN General Assembly 38th Session passed a resolution on the Near East providing for the convening of an international conference which would tackle the problem of an all-embracing, just settlement. The joint efforts of all the world's peace-loving forces are capable of frustrating the plans of the most reactionary circles of imperialism throughout the world, in the Near East included.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF WORLD POLITICS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 82-101

[V. Babak, V. Valdimirov, K. Nikolayev international roundup: "Current Problems of World Politics"]

[Excerpts] The start of the 1980's has been marked by an unprecedented exacerbation of class confrontation and ideological struggle in the international arena and of the two opposed courses in interstate relations. The frontier of 1983 and 1984 was packed to the limit with events of varying levels in terms of scale, content and significance reflecting and embodying the actual course and vital dynamics of this confrontation.

The forces of international reaction continued their proclaimed "crusade" in vain attempts to hold and turn back man's forward progress. Their actions have inflamed the international situation to the utmost and led to a palpable growth of the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war. The question of the protection of people's future and life on Earth itself has assumed particular seriousness and urgency in this connection.

But the scale of the danger emanating from imperialism and the growing recognition thereof by the peoples have contributed to the increased dimensions of the antimilitarist, anti-imperialist movement and a strengthening of the cohesion of its ranks. Despite the entire complexity and ambiguity of the international life of this period, the fact that the forces of socialism, progress and peace as a whole kept a constant hold of the strategic initiative and successfully opposed the military-force pressure of imperialism remains what is most important and determining therein.

In the Socialist World

Under the leadership of the fraternal communist and workers parties the peoples of the socialist community countries are continuing to advance successfully along the path of socialist and communist building and winning new victories here.

CEMA celebrated its 35th birthday in January 1984. The formation of CEMA was the result of persevering and consistent efforts of the CPSU and the fraternal communist and workers parties. This work led to impressive results. With

10 percent of the world's population the CEMA countries currently possess one-third of world industrial and scientific-technical potential, and they account for one-third of world industrial and scientific-technical potential, and they account for one-fourth of the national income derived in the world and one-fifth of world agricultural production. The economy of these states is developing in stable manner and at a high rate. Thus in the period 1950-1982 the CEMA countries' national income grew by a factor of 8.3, while in the EEC it grew by a factor of 3.3, industrial production grew by factors of 13.2 and 3.7 respectively and agricultural production by factors of 2.5 and 2. Together with the absolute growth there was also an increase in the CEMA states' share of the world production of the most important types of product. In the same period it rose from 14 to 21 percent in power engineering, from 8 to 24 percent in respect of oil and gas condensate, from 5 to 34 percent in terms of natural gas and from 19 to 32 percent in terms of steel.

The economic cooperation of the socialist countries had undergone profound quantitative and qualitative transformations in these decades. Initially it was organized on the basis of the development of reciprocal trade. The year of 1956 was the first year of cooperation based on coordination of 5-year national economic plans, which immediately imparted additional dynamism to this cooperation and increased the returns therefrom: reciprocal commodity turnover rose from R4.5 billion in 1950 to more than R160 billion in 1983.

A big event in the life of CEMA was its 23d (special) session (April 1969), which adopted the policy of the development of socialist economic integration. This strategic line was enshrined in the Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration, which was unanimously approved by the participants in the 25th CEMA Session in July 1971. The next important step in the development of socialist economic integration was the adoption in 1978 and 1979 of long-term goal-oriented cooperation programs, which determined the concerted strategy of the economic interaction of the community countries up to 1990. Such programs have been adopted and are being implemented in all the most important spheres of the economy: fuel, energy and raw material, engineering, agriculture and food industry, production of consumer goods and transportation. They are providing reliable reference points for tackling new socioeconomic tasks.

The 26th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the other fraternal parties noted the need for transition to the next stage of cooperation--coordination of economic policy as a whole. This new step is making fundamental changes to the coordination of national economic plans. The socialist CEMA states are now coordinating plans on the basis of the 1986-1990 plan-coordination program adopted by the 36th CEMA Session in 1982. Efforts are being concentrated in the most priority areas of cooperation and on the accomplishment of the tasks of increasing the efficiency of economic relations and the intensification of the national economies. Even today these relations have a big place in the national economy of each socialist country. Thus in 1982 the CEMA countries' reciprocal trade satisfied 68 percent of their machinery and equipment import requirements, 61 percent of fuel, mineral raw material and metal requirements, 46 percent of food requirements and 61 percent of industrial consumer goods requirements.

Against the background of the difficulties which the economy of the nonsocialist part of the world continued to experience in 1983 as a whole, the economy of the socialist countries was distinguished by dynamism and stability. The plenums of the communist and workers party central committees and sessions of the legislatures of the CEMA members at the end of 1983 summed up the preliminary results of the year's work and studied and approved the plans for 1984. A characteristic feature of the latter is that they are aimed at consolidating the positive results of 1983 in the sphere of the economy, a further intensification of social production and an increase in its efficiency and the people's well-being.

In Bulgaria derived national income increased by an average of 4.6 percent annually in 1981-1983 compared with the 3.7 percent outlined by the current 5-year plan, and industrial production here grew by an average of 5.1 percent and agricultural production by 3.5 percent. Wages increased 11 percent in 1983 compared with 1980 (all data are preliminary). The 1984 national economic plan provides for 3.8-percent growth of national income, a social labor productivity growth of 4 percent, industrial production growth of 5 percent and agricultural growth of 3.1 percent. Real income per capita will increase 2.5 percent and the social consumption funds 3.3 percent.

Despite the very severe drought which gripped the country in 1983, as a whole Hungary completed the year with results in line with the most important tasks of the national economic plan. Industrial production grew 1.4-1.5 percent, which corresponds to the plan targets. The gross agricultural product as a whole reached the 1982 level. The indicators of real income and consumption of the population also remained at the 1982 level. A 1.5-2-percent increase in national income and industrial production is outlined for 1984. In agriculture the set task is ensuring that the 1982 production volume is maintained in plant growing and surpassed in animal husbandry. The cereals harvest, in particular, will constitute no less than 1.4 tons per capita--one of the highest indicators in the world. The population's monetary income will increase, with regard for social payments, almost 8 percent.

Pronounced successes in the development of the basic sectors of the national economy were scored in Vietnam, where the average annual rate of increase in the production of food crops constituted 10 percent. A record harvest of these crops was gathered in in 1983--17 million tons. In 1984 it is planned to increase the volume of agricultural production 7 percent, industrial production 9.5 percent and labor productivity per industrial worker 5 percent.

The economy of the GDR, where in 1983 the industrial production growth rate surpassed the planned rate, is developing in stable manner. Marked successes were scored in ensuring the more rational use of raw material, energy and intermediate products: their annual consumption per unit industrial product declined 7 percent. The drought was reflected in the potato and sugar beet harvests, but over 10 million tons of cereals were gathered in. In 1984 the increase in national income is to constitute 4.4 percent, in industrial production 4.2 percent, in plant growing 8.4 percent and in meat production (dressed weight) 5.1 percent. The population's monetary income and marketable funds will grow noticeably.

On 1 January 1984 the working people of Cuba and all progressive mankind commemorated the 25th anniversary of the revolution which opened to the people of this country the way of creation and development. Under the harshest conditions, determined by proximity to the main citadel of imperialism, incessant provocations on the part of the United States, its subversive activity and constant threat of aggression, the Cuban working people are building socialism. Their accomplishments are all the more impressive. All the more graphic, particularly with respect to the peoples of Latin America, is the inspiring example of emancipated labor and the advantage of socialism.

More than 1,100 industrial enterprises (including about 170 in key sectors of the national economy with the USSR's assistance) have been built and new sectors of industry have been created on the island of freedom in the past 25 years. Engineering and metal-working products grew (in terms of value) from 29 million pesos in 1958 to almost 900 million pesos in 1982. Steel production increased from 24,000 to 301,000 tons a year. The production of nickel-cobalt concentrate (an important export product) from 12,500 to 41,000 tons; and electric power generation from 2.55 billion to 11 billion kilowatt-hours.

The successes of Cuban agriculture are also very considerable. Given the continued high level of the production of sugar--the traditional export product, which prior to the revolution constituted the basis of the island's monoculture economy--the production of food crops important for the diet has increased many times over. The production of rice (520,000 tons in 1982) and vegetables has more than doubled in 25 years, and 7 times more citrus fruit is being harvested now. Cuba has raised the production of mineral fertilizers by a factor of 6.6 and the fish catch by a factor of almost 9.

The country's gross social product more than doubled in the period 1972-1982 alone. Tremendous changes also occurred in the social sphere and in surmounting the former poverty and illiteracy on the basis of the economic achievements.

The year of 1983 was also a good one for Cuba. According to preliminary data, the gross social product grew 5 percent and labor productivity 3.5 percent. Pretty good indicators were achieved in agriculture, despite the natural disasters which hit Cuba at the start of last year. Approved by a session of the National Assembly of the people's power, the uniform plan of socioeconomic development for 1984 provides for a further increase in national income of 5.5-6 percent and in labor productivity of 2.5-3 percent. Appropriations for such social purposes as education and health care will increase considerably--5.1 and 14.3 percent respectively.

In Mongolia the results of 1983 in agriculture were considerably higher than the indicators of the preceding year and in industry they outstripped both what was achieved in 1982 and the plan outlines. Provision of the working people with all the basic types of consumer goods improved. According to the plan for the current year, the growth of national income will constitute 6 percent, industrial production 7.8 percent and agricultural production 9 percent. More than 60,000 hectares of virgin land will be developed.

Describing the situation in Poland, W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee, emphasized that the difficult, but now manifest process of a way out of the economic slump is continuing. The most important areas and frontiers of this process are determined by the plan for 1983-1985. According to preliminary estimates, for the first time in the last 4 years a certain increase in national income is expected in the country's national economy in 1983. Industrial production will grow by 4.5-5 percent. High results were achieved in the coal industry (190 million tons of coal in 1983). More than 22 million tons of cereals were harvested. For the first time in the past several years there was an increase in newly built apartments. The 1984 plan provides for an increase in national income of 3.5 percent, in industrial production of 4.5-5.5 percent and in agricultural production of 1.4-1.8 percent.

Polish leaders emphasize that an increasingly large number of working people is accepting the party's arguments and believes in its capacity for ensuring the country's security, guaranteeing dependable alliances which are fundamental for Poland and continuing to successfully overcome the consequences of the economic crisis. W. Jaruzelski termed the strengthening of Poland's positions in the socialist community and the decisive expansion of cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries a most important achievement of the past 2 years.

In 10 months of 1973 industrial production in Romania increased in gross terms by approximately 5 percent with a labor productivity growth of 4 percent. A difficult situation developed in the country's agriculture and hydraulic engineering owing to the lack of snow of the 1982-1983 winter and the unusually arid summer. The plan for the current year provides for a further increase in the basic indicators of the national economy: in the gross social product by 4.6 percent and in industrial commodity output (in terms of value) by 6.7 percent.

The visit to Romania from 30 January through 1 February 1984 of a party-government delegation of the USSR headed by A.A. Gromyko was a major event in Soviet-Romanian relations of recent times. N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, received the delegation and had talks with it. The sides noted the ongoing development of bilateral relations, emphasized the importance of the further strengthening of all-around economic cooperation between CEMA countries and exchanged opinions on important international issues. The USSR and Romania declared the need to increase efforts in order to halt the negative development of events, put an end to the arms race and switch to disarmament, nuclear particularly. The two states' interest in contributing in every possible way to the continuation of the process begun by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, including the success of the Stockholm conference, was declared.

A certain acceleration of the economic growth rate was observed in 1983 in Czechoslovakia. National income grew 2.2 percent, industrial production 2.6 percent and the population's real income 2.4 percent. The 1984 plan provides for an increase in national income of 3 percent, in labor productivity of 2.6 percent and industrial production of 2.9 percent. The national economic plan

of the CSSR, like similar documents of the other socialist countries, emphasizes particularly the accelerated introduction of the latest achievements of scientific-technical progress, the most rational use of energy and raw material resources and production capacity, an expansion of housing construction and the development of all-around cooperation with the fraternal countries.

A working friendly visit to the USSR was paid from 27 February through 1 March 1984 by V. Zarkovic, vice president of the Yugoslav Presidium, and the persons accompanying him. V. Zarkovic was received by K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In the course of the conversation and also the negotiations in Moscow there was an exchange of opinions on questions of Soviet-Yugoslav relations and certain urgent international problems. Mutual interest in the further development of relations between the CPSU and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the USSR and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was expressed. A high evaluation was made, in particular, of economic and scientific-technical cooperation, which is being developed comprehensively on a long-term mutually profitable and stable basis.

The success of the cause of preserving and strengthening peace, a CPSU Central Committee special plenum emphasized, depends to a considerable extent on how great the influence in the world arena of the socialist countries is and how assertive, purposeful and concerted their actions are. "In comprehensively developing and deepening cohesion and cooperation with the socialist community countries in all spheres, including, of course, such an important sphere as the economic sphere," K.U. Chernenko says, "we are thereby making a big contribution to the cause of peace, progress and the security of the peoples."

Preliminary data on fulfillment of the 1983 economic plan, which as a whole testify to a growth of production in a number of sectors, have been published in China. Thus almost 40 million tons of steel, approximately 700 million tons of coal and 106 million tons of oil were produced. The production of rolled metal, cement and chemical fertilizers, the grain harvest and cotton production increased. At the same time a decline in the production of certain types of product was observed, while with respect to others the high figures of increase conceal absolute values testifying merely to a return to the indicators which had been achieved by the Chinese economy earlier. Serious disproportions remain in the country's national economy, and many financial and economic problems have not been solved. The journal BAN YUE TAN, which is authoritative in the PRC, noted, describing the general results of 1983, that despite the economic growth rate which had been achieved, "economic efficiency is inadequate."

According to an NCNA report, in accordance with the outlines of the current, sixth, five-year plan for 1981-1985, the volumes of industrial and agricultural production are to increase 4-5 percent in 1984. A pronounced role continues to be assigned the attraction of foreign capital. Agreements on the building with its participation of a further 30 enterprises were concluded in 1983. The PRC currently has 112 such enterprises. Last September they were granted additional tax concessions and currency and commercial transaction privileges.

Certain positive changes in Soviet-Chinese relations have been observed recently. An agreement between the governments of the USSR and the PRC on commodity turnover and payments for 1984, which outlines a considerable expansion of trade in terms of volume and product mix, was signed at the start of this year in Beijing. Total trade volume in 1984 will constitute approximately R1 billion or will increase 60 percent compared with 1983. The prospects of the expansion of bilateral commercial-economic relations were discussed during the negotiations.

The USSR, as the leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state have emphasized repeatedly, has invariably supported and continues to support a further improvement in relations with the PRC. The positive development of Soviet-Chinese relations is not to the liking merely of the forces which would like to benefit from the absence of normal mutual relations between our country and China. As far as the Soviet and Chinese peoples are concerned, they could only gain from such an improvement. The political climate in the world as a whole would also gain; socialism's role in the international arena would also be enhanced.

The most notable event in the PRC's foreign policy in the period in question was the trip of Zhao Ziyang, premier of the PRC State Council, to the United States, where from 7 through 16 January 1984 he held talks with President R. Reagan, Secretary of State G. Shultz and Defense Secretary C. Weinberger. Questions of bilateral relations and problems of the international situation were discussed, and two agreements--on industrial and scientific-technical cooperation--were signed.

Commenting on the results of the visit, many foreign observers note that both sides deliberately endeavored to blunt the political differences which exist between them, particularly on the Taiwan problem, which is such a delicate issue for both of them, and concentrate efforts on commercial-economic and scientific-technical relations. Washington was particularly insistent in pushing through such an interpretation of the course and results of the negotiations. However, it was not successful in concealing the existence of potentially explosive problems in bilateral relations. The R. Reagan government is emphatically pursuing a "two Chinas" line. On the very day that the U.S. President was ceremonially welcoming the high Chinese guest at the White House the head of a representative delegation of the U.S. Congress, M. Hatfield, declared on arrival on Taiwan that U.S. military assistance to "America's long-standing friends"--the Kuomintang--would be granted in 1984 in the same volume as in the past and that the development of American-Chinese (PRC--author) relations by no means signifies a winding down of the United States' relations with Taiwan. For its part, the PRC recalls that, despite identical or close views on some issues, China and the United States have differences on others and in recent months has stepped up somewhat its criticism of America's policy in Central America, the Near East and Southern Africa. The foreign press claims, however, that China is loudest in its criticism of the aspects of U.S. foreign policy which are not of direct significance for Beijing, but continues to adhere to views "paralleling" those of the United States on relations with the USSR and also on the situation surrounding Afghanistan and in Indochina.

Against the Policy of Aggression and Diktat

Recent months have been marked by new tragic events in long-suffering Lebanon. The exacerbation of differences within the Palestine resistance movement was a consequence of the continuing American-Israeli aggression against this small Arab country. Having arisen on the basis of different approaches to the question of methods of struggle for a just solution of the Palestine problem, they brought about, as has been the case in the past also, unfortunately, armed clashes between the Palestinians themselves. The unnatural, senseless struggle led to new casualties in the ranks of the Palestinian fighters. It also carried away many lives of peaceful Palestinian refugees, who had taken refuge in the area of the North Lebanese city of Tripoli. On 20 December 4,000 Palestinian fighters were forced to evacuate from Lebanon.

Under the conditions of Israel's continued occupation of a considerable part of Lebanese territory and the United States' direct armed interference in the affairs of this country such internecine strife is not only weakening the Palestine movement's own positions, it is impeding the formation of a pan-Arab front for struggle against the aggression of the United States and Israel against Lebanon. The discord in the ranks of the PLO is causing sincere concern in the friends of the Palestinian people and Arab countries. As the Algerian newspaper EL-MOUDJAHID observed, "following the bloody and grievous events in the Lebanese city of Tripoli and its suburbs and following the evacuation from there of Y. Arafat's subunits, the PLO is confronted with the difficult and urgent task of restoring the unity and cohesion of its ranks. We would like to believe that on this occasion also it will be tackled successfully for the future of the Palestinian people is at stake."

The United States has markedly extended the scale of the undeclared war in Lebanon. It has concentrated off the shores of this country a giant naval fleet with 30,000 servicemen and 300 aircraft. At the start of December, shortly after the visit of the new Israeli prime minister to Washington, which strengthened even more the two countries' military-strategic cooperation directed against the Arabs, the American military subjected the Druze regions of the Lebanese mountains, the southern outskirts of Beirut and other parts of the country to intensive shelling. The escalation of aggressive operations in Lebanon undertaken on the instructions of the White House confirmed as clearly as could be that Washington has finally discarded the mask of "impartial mediator" in the Arab-Israeli conflict and has openly adopted a policy of military-force pressure in respect of the progressive forces of the Arab East. A statement made by Y. Shamir on his return from the United States testifies to this. "We agreed," he said, "on the creation of a joint military-political committee which as of the start of next January (1984--author) will embark on the development of the principles of Israeli-American cooperation and coordination of action in respect of the entire set of unresolved problems in the Near East." The agreement on political, strategic and economic cooperation officialized during Y. Shamir's visit to Washington, the London FINANCIAL TIMES observes, in practice affords Israel unlimited possibilities in the implementation of policy in respect of the Arab neighbors. It is in fact a policy of aggression based on military, political and economic assistance of the transatlantic patron rendered without any conditions on the part of the United States.

The military-strategic alliance of the United States and Israel aimed against the Arab peoples has encountered emphatic condemnation not only on the part of the Arabs but also broad circles of the international community. In December, on the final day of the UN General Assembly 38th Session, the representatives of 81 UN member states voted for a resolution condemning the "strategic cooperation" between the United States and Israel and demanded that the United States refrain from strengthening Israel's military potential, which is prompting it to aggressive acts against its neighbors. The U.S. Administration's entire Near East policy was in fact condemned.

In January-February 1984 ships of the U.S. 6th Fleet, assembled off the Lebanese coast, repeatedly shelled the positions of the national-patriotic forces and Muslim population centers. The aggressive actions of the American military were coordinated with the provocations of the Israeli occupation forces aimed against the Lebanese patriots. The situation in the country became even more complicated as a result of the increasing foreign interference.

In mid-February detachments of the Progressive Socialist Party, relying on the support of the Druze population, inflicted a serious defeat on the militia of the rightwing Christian parties and Lebanese Army subunits operating on its side. Together with armed formations of Shi'ite Muslims (Amal) they took control of a number of strategically important centers of population, including the village of (Khalde) south of Beirut. There was fierce fighting in the capital itself along the so-called Green Line, which divides the city in two. Press agencies and the foreign press note the mass desertion of servicemen from the Lebanese Army unwilling to participate in a fratricidal war. Of the 10 Lebanese armed forces' brigades, four refused to conduct combat operations against the national-patriotic forces. As a result of the bitter fighting in mid-February the zone controlled by the national-patriotic forces expanded. As emphasized during a meeting of the leadership of the Lebanese Communist Party and the Progressive Socialist Party, the successes of the national-patriotic forces were an important stage of the struggle against the Israeli occupation and the American armed presence in Lebanon and have created the prerequisites for a just political settlement.

The staunchness of Lebanon's national-patriotic forces performed a definite role in the decision of the British, Italian and French governments to withdraw or considerably reduce their armed contingents which were a part of the so-called "multinational force". The U.S. Administration also was forced to announce the transfer of its forces from Beirut to the ships off the Lebanese coast. Some American marines remained in the Lebanese capital here. The essence of this maneuver of Washington's was revealed by President R. Reagan himself, who declared at a press conference: "At the present time we are carrying out a redeployment of the forces. Bear in mind, we are not withdrawing, we are simply transferring to other positions which are somewhat easier to defend."

The Lebanese patriotic forces demanded the cancellation of the Lebanese-Israeli separate "peace agreement" of 17 May 1983, which was imposed by the United States and Israel and which infringes the national sovereignty and does not correspond to the national interests of the country. Under the conditions of political crisis which had gripped the state and the defeat of the Lebanese

Army by the national-patriotic forces Lebanese Foreign Minister E. Salem expounded to representatives of the press on 17 February 1984 a new plan for a settlement of the Lebanese crisis. In particular, the plan provided for a cease-fire, abrogation of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, a resumption of the Geneva conference on national reconciliation, the creation of a government of national unity, the withdrawal from Lebanon within 3 months of Israeli and other foreign forces and "security measures" in South Lebanon for protection of Israel's northern border. The latter, as is known, is using the demand for "security" as a pretext for the occupation of South Lebanon.

The Lebanese opposition forces and also the Syrian Government emphatically rejected this plan inasmuch as it puts the Israeli occupation forces and the Syrian military contingent, which is in Lebanon following a decision of the Arab League, on the same footing. Furthermore, as a statement of the Syrian SANA press agency observed, the ideas expressed in the plan "are contrary to what was achieved at the Geneva conference on national reconciliation and in reality contribute to implementation of the 17 May 1983 agreement between Lebanon and Israel and not its abrogation." At the start of March 1984 the Lebanese Government decided to cancel the said agreement.

The principled position occupied by Syria in connection with the events in Lebanon is causing unconcealed rage in Washington. After all, it is this position which has precluded the possibility of the realization of a "second Camp David"--an Israeli-Lebanese separate agreement, which had been carefully prepared by Washington and Tel Aviv. This is why in recent months the United States has been engaged in open aggressive operations against Syria. Attacks by American aircraft on Syrian forces' positions in Lebanon have been followed by the concentrated shelling of Syrian positions from the guns of the battleship "New Jersey". In the political plane American diplomacy has initiated an assertive campaign aimed at discrediting Syria and attempting to isolate it in the Arab world. Emissaries of the White House, including Secretary of State G. Shultz, are sparing no effort, endeavoring to counterpose the so-called "moderate" Arab states to Syria. But, despite all Washington's tricks, it has not succeeded in shaking Syria's resistance and weakening its alliance with Lebanon's national-patriotic forces.

The just struggle of the Lebanese, Palestinian and other Arab peoples is fully understood and supported by the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union. This was confirmed once again during the meeting on 13 January in the CPSU Central Committee with a delegation of the Lebanese Progressive Socialist Party headed by its chairman W. Jumblatt. B.N. Ponomarev, candidate of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and K.N. Brutents, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, participated in the meeting on the Soviet side. The representatives of the CPSU expressed solidarity with the Lebanese patriots defending their people's right to free and independent development. They confirmed the consistent Soviet position of support for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The participants in the meeting condemned the aggressive policy of the United States in respect of the Arab countries, its threats against Syria and its flagrant interference in Lebanese affairs. They emphatically supported the immediate and unconditional

withdrawal from Lebanese territory of the forces of Israel and NATO countries. Both sides emphasized that "this is an essential prerequisite of a just and lasting intra-Lebanese settlement and the development of the Lebanese Republic as a single, sovereign and democratic Arab state."

On 18 January K.U. Chernenko, B.N. Ponomarev and K.N. Brutents received in the CPSU Central Committee a delegation of the Communist Party of Israel headed by M. Vilner, general secretary of the Communist Party of Israel Central Committee. In the course of the meeting the sides condemned the policy being pursued by the United States and Israel of imposing separate deals on the Arab states, which impede the achievement of an all-embracing settlement and exacerbate the situation in the Near East. They again declared that the Near East conflict may be resolved only by collective efforts, by way of the convening of an international conference with the participation of the USSR, the United States and all interested parties, including the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people.

The situation in the Near East was the subject of discussion at the fourth meeting of heads of state and government of countries which are a part of the Islamic Conference organization, which was held in Casablanca (Morocco) from 16 through 19 January. In the adopted documents the participants in the meeting emphatically condemned Israel's expansionist policy and the so-called American-Israeli "strategic cooperation," which is prompting Tel Aviv to continue the aggression in respect of the Arab states. The leaders of the Muslim countries declared their support for the plan drawn up in Fez for the establishment of peace in the Near East and expressed their solidarity with the Arab people of Palestine fighting for realization of their legitimate national rights. The leaders of the Islamic states condemned the continuing Israeli occupation of Arab territory, including East Jerusalem, and the creation of Israeli militarized settlements on the captured territories. The participants in the meeting also expressed serious concern in connection with the continuation of the Iran-Iraq conflict and appealed to both sides for the speediest end to it.

Following lengthy debate, the decision was made under the pressure of conservative Muslim regimes to restore Egypt's membership of this organization, from which it had been expelled for signing the separate peace with Israel in 1979. This decision was sharply condemned by a number of progressive Arab and other Muslim countries. The meeting also approved admittance to the organization of its 45th member--the Sultanate of Brunei--which had gained independence at the start of the year.

In the front ranks of the struggle for the removal of the threat of war and the consolidation of peace on the Asian continent is the Republic of India, whose political authority is growing constantly throughout the world. Since March 1983 this country has been the leader of the nonaligned movement and as of 1 January 1984 it has taken its seat in the Security Council, to which it has been elected for the next 2 years. India intends to coordinate the positions of the group of nonaligned countries on urgent international problems in the Security Council and in the United Nations as a whole. As (V. Nambiar), leader of the Department for the Nonaligned Movement of the Indian Foreign Ministry,

observes, "as chairman of the nonaligned movement, India aspires primarily to maintain continuity of the policy which has justified itself since the Havana conference on such questions as preventing war, disarmament and the struggle for a new international economic order."

The country's consistent peace-loving policy, which has earned high authority among the world's progressive forces, is reflected in all the political steps taken by Delhi in the international arena. It is for this reason that imperialism and all world reaction are stepping up hostile actions against the republic. As Prime Minister I. Gandhi declared in an interview with the weekly BLITZ, this is being expressed, inter alia, in the creation on the periphery of India's borders of "a ring of hostile states." The fact that a sharp outburst of anti-Indian hysteria in Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh was observed after U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger's visit to a number of states neighboring India was evidently not fortuitous. As Western military specialists observe, Pakistan is already in fact integrated in the global system of Washington's outposts, while Indian Defense Minister R. Venkataraman has called this country a "forward strong point" of the United States in Asia. Recently Washington has been displaying increasingly great interest in the port of Chittagong in Bangladesh, Trincomalee Bay in Sri Lanka and a number of ports in Pakistan. They are all in direct proximity to India's borders.

The situation in the northwest states of Punjab and Haryana became sharply exacerbated in mid-February. Religious-communal clashes flared up. The armed struggle between the Hindu and Sikh communities, to which the majority of the population of these states belongs, led to human casualties and serious material loss. As is known, in recent years separatist groupings supported by foreign reaction have been struggling for the separation of the areas populated predominantly by Sikhs from India and the creation there of so-called Halistan--a religious Sikh state. Armed terrorist groups are operating in Punjab which are carrying out provocative killings and sabotage, robbing banks, hijacking aircraft and intimidating the population. According to a report of the Indian press, some of these groups are being trained and supplied with weapons in Pakistan and have connections with CIA agents. The Sikh Alkali Dal Party, which was defeated at the state assembly elections in 1980, has, in particular, engaged a stormy antigovernment activity. On I. Gandhi's initiative a tripartite conference was convened in Delhi on 14 February on the Punjab's problems with the participation of government ministers, an Alkali Dal delegation and representatives of the opposition parties. However, the armed clashes in Punjab and Haryana which erupted on this day forced the postponement of the conference. Many Indian newspapers express the assumption that in a number of cases the bloody incidents were deliberately provoked to frustrate the conference.

The facts show convincingly that the discord between neighboring states and the religious-communal strife in India are being deliberately supported and exaggerated by internal and foreign reaction to undermine the country's national unity, destabilize the situation and force the government to turn aside from the peace-loving anti-imperialist policy.

The eighth session of the intergovernmental Soviet-Indian commission for economic and scientific-technical cooperation, which charted the arterial directions of the two countries' practical interaction for the years ahead, was held 6-9 December in Delhi. A protocol on commodity exchange for 1984 and a program of scientific-technical cooperation in the period 1984-1987 were signed. An understanding was reached on an extension of production cooperation between Soviet enterprises and engineering plants built with the USSR's assistance in Ranchi, Durgapur and Hardwar. Questions of possible cooperation in the installation in India of a number of new facilities in the sphere of power engineering and ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy; the directions and forms of development of relations in oil and coal industry; and the course of the preparation of the basic directions of economic, commercial and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and India after 1990 were also examined.

Receiving at the start of February a Soviet delegation which had arrived in Delhi to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the commissioning of the foundry in Bhilai, which had been built with the USSR's assistance, Indian President Z. Singh made a high evaluation of the assistance given his country by the Soviet Union in the establishment and development of industry. Thanks to this assistance and support, India maintains its economic independence. India sees the Soviet Union, he emphasized, as its most reliable and sincere friend.

On 7 January the people of much-suffering Kampuchea commemorated the fifth anniversary of the removal of the hated Pol Pot regime and the installation of people's power. As the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers greetings telegram to Heng Samrin and Chan Si, leaders of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, observed, "in the last 5 years the Kampuchean people under the leadership of their combat vanguard--the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea--and relying on the support of the socialist community countries and the world's progressive forces, have overcome numerous difficulties and scored considerable successes on the way to building a new life."

In the sphere of economic building the party has adopted a policy primarily of an upsurge of agriculture. The main result of the party's policy here is the fact that it has succeeded not only in eliminating starvation but also within certain limits of solving the food problem as a whole. This has contributed to a considerable extent to the stabilization of life in the country and strengthened people's belief in the success of the revolution. In the sphere of industrial development the state supports a combination of state and private initiative and it is stimulating primarily the production of goods in everyday use.

Considerable successes have been scored by public education. All forms of tuition in the country are encompassing 1.6 million persons. Of the more than 1 million illiterates which the country had, approximately 600,000 have now been taught to read and write. A considerable number of Kampuchean students are being taught in the socialist countries, approximately 1,500 of whom in the Soviet Union.

Currently the people's efforts are concentrated in three main areas: the further expansion of agricultural production in order to achieve an annual rice harvest of 2.5 million tons; the development of industrial and handicrafts production with the task of exceeding the level reached in 1983 in these sectors by a factor of 2-3; and an improvement in managerial work in the sphere of distribution and exchange, which is a most important aspect of the stabilization of life and production.

People's Kampuchea is making its contribution to the struggle for the consolidation of peace and international security. Together with the fraternal Indochina countries of Vietnam and Laos it advocates a normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia and the establishment of good-neighborly relations between all states of the region.

The eighth conference of foreign ministers of the three Indochina countries--Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea--was held 28-29 January 1984 in Vientiane. Its participants discussed the situation which had come about in the region and noted that it was essential to formulate a common approach to the settlement of Southeast Asia's problems based on equality and respect for the legitimate interests of each of the two groups of countries: countries--ASEAN and Indochina--without the foisting of decisions on one another and without outside pressure. "The three Indochina countries," the conference communique says, "are prepared for bilateral consultations and a dialogue between the two groups of countries: ASEAN and Indochina. All the proposals submitted by each side will be a topic of discussion on the basis of the principle of equality. The People's Republic of Kampuchea confirms its good will, not wishing the question of its participation to impede the start of a dialogue between the two groups of countries. The conferees resolved to choose Laos and Vietnam as representatives of the three Indochina countries for participation in negotiations between the two groups of countries." The participants in the meeting confirmed their readiness for any form of dialogue to discuss the problems which exist between the two groups of countries. The conference demonstrated the sincere aspiration of the Indochina countries to peace and good relations with their neighbors.

The last winter on the African continent was also marked by complex political events. The South African military considerably expanded the aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. The large-scale invasion by Pretoria's troops of the territory of this country was of the nature of open war against the Angolan people. Motorized infantry brigades, artillery and paratroop units and over 100 aircraft and helicopters invaded deep into Angolan territory, wiping out the peaceful civilian population and carrying out scorched earth tactics. Attempting to justify these barbaric actions, Pretoria referred, as before, to the far-fetched pretext of the alleged presence in Angola of Namibian guerrillas from SWAPO. However, the strikes by the racist military were against industrial centers and population centers of Angola hundreds of kilometers from the Namibian border.

To drag out a solution of the question of the granting of independence to Namibia the Pretoria authorities are "linking" it with the presence in Angola of a contingent of Cuban internationalists, who, as is known, are in Angola

at the request of the Angolan Government. They are assisting the young republic in training the Angolan people's armed forces and helping defend the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Angola, which is being subjected to attacks and open aggression on the part of South Africa and mercenaries from the UNITA bandit formations.

Behind all these subversive operations against Angola is international imperialism, primarily the U.S. Administration. The existence of a conspiracy between Washington and Pretoria is easily confirmed by the fact that in December and January the United States declined to vote in the Security Council for a resolution condemning South Africa and demanding the withdrawal of its forces from Angolan territory. Upon a second examination of this question the United States declared that it would not veto the resolution only if the clause concerning sanctions against South Africa were deleted from it. It is precisely such sanctions which the UN Charter envisages in such cases.

In their struggle against the aggression of South Africa and the intrigues of imperialism and reaction the Angolan people rely on the progressive forces of the whole world, primarily the multifaceted assistance and support of the Soviet Union. As O. Troyanovskiy, permanent USSR representative at the United Nations, observed, the USSR emphatically condemns South Africa's aggressive policy in respect of Angola. He emphasized that the USSR, which is linked to Angola by the Friendship and Cooperation Treaty, has given and will continue to give it all possible support in defense of sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

The bloody internecine war in Chad has been continuing for almost two decades. At the start of January, thanks to the vigorous efforts of M.H. Mariam, chairman of the OAU and leader of Ethiopia, a meeting of all military-political groupings of Chad was convened in Addis Ababa. Unfortunately, the attempt to bring the fratricidal war to an end was unsuccessful owing to the obstructionist position occupied by the representatives of the authorities in Ndjamena. The head of the regime, H. Habre, did not go to the Ethiopian capital at all, while the delegation which he sent, putting forward one procedural demand after another, endeavored to lead the meeting away from discussion of the essence of the issues. As the delegation of the Transitional Government of National Unity (TGNU) rightly observed, "the absence in Addis Ababa of Hissene Habre was eloquent testimony to his subordination to the diktat of the foreign masters who are interfering in Chad's internal affairs with impunity, proceeding from their own egotistic interests, and putting obstacles in the way of Chadians' national reconciliation."

The frustration of the meeting within the OAU framework was used as a pretext for the expansion of French military intervention. In August 1983 some 3,000 French paratroops together with 2,000 Zaïrean soldiers and mercenaries saved the Habre regime from defeat. Two factors brought about the French intervention in Chad: the endeavor to strengthen France's own neocolonialist presence in its former colony and the pressure of Washington, which aspired to consolidate NATO's positions in Central Africa. At the end of January

the French forces extended their occupation zone. At the orders of C. Hernu, minister of national defense of France, they advanced more than 100 kilometers north and captured a line running along the 16th parallel.

Commenting on French forces' invasion of the northern regions of the country, T. Gadengo, TGNU secretary of state for foreign affairs, declared that France's actions were an outright declaration of war on the Chadian people. It is a question of aggression confirming France's intention of increasing military operations against the TGNU forces, he emphasized. Opposing the expansion of French military intervention in the affairs of Chad, the newspaper L'HUMANITE observed that "the number of demonstrations in support of negotiations on Chad under the control of the OAU and against the interference of France and other countries in Chad's internal affairs, which only the OAU has a right to examine, is growing in Africa."

The political situation in Central America, where the threat of Washington's open armed interference in the affairs of Nicaragua and El Salvador has increased, remained extraordinarily dangerous last winter. Washington has cobbled together, trained and armed bands of terrorists carrying out raids and acts of sabotage against Nicaragua from the territory of neighboring Honduras. Air raids on the town of Mansanillo and the port of Potosi were carried out from there on 2 and 3 February. There are dead and wounded as a result of the piratical attacks. Lines of communication were damaged and fuel dumps destroyed.

D. Ortega, coordinator of the Directorate of Nicaragua's Government of National Reconstruction, placed the entire responsibility for these aggressive actions on the United States. Speaking at a press conference in Caracas, he noted that "the order for the attacks could have been given only by the United States. The Honduran Army would not have dared carry them out without the appropriate orders." These raids were regarded by political observers as a rehearsal for aggression against Nicaragua. A possible scenario of the development of events is simple. A conflict provoked by Washington between Nicaragua and Honduras is to be the pretext for the direct military intervention of the United States, which would hasten to "assist" Honduras, which has allegedly become a "victim of Nicaraguan aggression".

The White House long since adopted a policy of turning Honduras into an outpost in the struggle against the liberation movement in Latin America and a base for aggressive operations against Nicaragua and interference in the affairs of El Salvador. As became known to AFP, the U.S. Southern Command, which is stationed in Panama, is prepared to adopt measures to "settle the Nicaragua problem militarily." Honduras, a country which, in the words of Gen P. Gorman, commander of this military district, is regarded as a "springboard for operations against Nicaragua and Cuba," could serve as an ideal base for an invasion of Nicaragua.

The Pentagon has embarked on the construction on Honduran territory of a further five aircraft runways. A regional military training center is operating in Puerto Castilla, which will shortly become a military base. Communications systems, with the use of artificial satellites included, are being set up. In the very heart of Central America the Pentagon is developing a springboard for aggressive actions in the region.

As D. Ortega emphasized, the country's patriots, while strengthening their defense, do not intend to succumb to provocations and are continuing to seek peaceful solutions of the problem. General elections, in the course of which a president, vice president and deputies of a national assembly will be elected, were announced for 4 November at a meeting on 21 February in Managua devoted to the memory of the country's national hero, Gen A. Sandino, who died 50 years ago at the hands of the Somocistas. The right to take part in these elections will be granted all legal political parties, opposition parties included. The country's leaders intend to continue the process of strengthening revolutionary democracy begun after the ouster of Somoza.

Considerable successes were scored last winter by the patriots of El Salvador. On the eve of the new year detachments of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front began a successful offensive against government forces. On 31 December they captured and held on to for some time the fort of El Paraiso (situated on several heights and surrounded by a special defense zone), which had been built in accordance with a Washington plan in 1981 and which was considered impregnable. In the course of the battles for this fort approximately 300 soldiers and officers of the government forces were killed or wounded and approximately 200 were taken prisoner. "The defeat at El Paraiso was the most devastating for the government army in the 4 years of war against the guerrillas," a UPI correspondent was forced to acknowledge.

The farce of elections, which it is planned to hold at the end of March, was begun in El Salvador for camouflage. It is proposed staging the performance in accordance with all the rules of bourgeois democracy. Right and ultraright parties are to compete between themselves, "criticizing" each other. The Salvadoran National Liberation Front (FNL) and the Revolutionary-Democratic Front (RDF) have refused to take part in this comedy.

An FNL and RDF document was distributed in Mexico City on 9 February which contains proposals for the creation of a provisional government of El Salvador based on broad representation. The document says, inter alia: "The escalation of the Reagan administration's interference in El Salvador is dragging out the war there and threatening to involve other states of the region in the conflict. We are convinced that the cohesion of the majority of political and social forces, which will be able to solve the problem, having ousted the ruling regime and removed foreign interference, is essential for the achievement of peace in our country." The progressive organizations' proposals provide for the formation of a provisional government, in which "all forces now advocating the ouster of the regime of the oligarchy, the establishment of sovereignty and national independence and that private ownership and foreign investments not be in opposition to the public interest will be represented."

The document provides for the implementation of a number of urgent measures, including cancellation of the current 1983 constitution, the state of siege and laws infringing personal and social liberties, the release of all political prisoners, complete guarantee of rights and democratic liberties, the disbandment of the security corps, "death squads" and their political organization--the National Republican Alliance party--the withdrawal of American advisers, a purge of the armed forces and also a wide range of socioeconomic reforms.

For the realization of these proposals, their authors believe, it is necessary to start negotiations in which the FNL and RDF should participate on the one hand and representatives of the government, the armed forces and the United States on the other. Furthermore, with the consent of the parties, mediators and also representatives of international forums such as, for example, the Contadora Group, should participate in the negotiations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

WESTERN SOCIOLOGISTS' OPTIMISM ON 'INFORMATION SOCIETY' CRITICIZED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian Number 4, April 1984 carries on pages 106-114 a 6,200-word Yu. Nikulichev article entitled "Cul-de-sacs of the 'Information Society'" which portrays the West's vision of the postindustrial or information revolution as an unrealistic means to overcoming society's economic and social "contradictions." The move from an industrial to an information society is covered through an examination of Western journal articles on the growing role of "postindustrial services;" selected articles by D. Bell, A. Toffler, R. Breitenstein, M. Porat, and J. Martin are assessed for their perspectives on developing a "new social structure." The author concludes that overly optimistic projections of one branch of employment to another, due to greater professional specialization and the disappearance of 'old' professions, or the need for greater government financing of social services to support displaced workers. "Promising heaven in the 'technicist', 'electronic', information' and other societies, they in point of fact propose that the masses make peace with existing reality in the name of a very problematic idealistic future."

CSO: 1816/8b-P

BOOK ON DEVELOPMENT OF WORKER CONTROL OVER PRODUCTION

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 141-143

[Yu. Borko review: "Important Direction of the Class Struggle of the Proletariat"]

[Text] The social elevation of the proletariat, which, as V.I. Lenin pointed out, represents a natural result of the development of the antagonism between labor and capital, is manifested in the most diverse forms. One such manifestation is the expansion of the range of the working class' socioeconomic struggle in the capitalist countries and the advancement by its organizations of a number of demands questioning capital's arrogated right to dispose of economic and political power in monopoly fashion. Among them is the slogan of the working people's equal participation in the control of the economy and the establishment of worker control over production.

The author of the monograph in question,* V.A. Vinogradov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, has set himself the task of analyzing from the first steps right through our day the development of the proletariat's struggle for worker control over production. It is the first time that such a study has been undertaken in our country, and this determines both its value and its complexity.

The book consistently examines the struggle of the Russian proletariat for worker control in the pre-October period and the practical implementation of this demand following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution (chapters 1 and 2); the struggle of the proletariat of the European capitalist countries for worker control over production in the years of revolutionary upsurge of 1918-1923 and in the subsequent interwar years (chapter 3); realization of the idea of worker control in the people's democracy countries (chapter 4); and the movement of the working people of West European states for control over production in the postwar decades (chapters 5, 6 and 7). Such a broad chronological and spatial framework has enabled the author to illustrate

* V.A. Vinogradov, "Rabochiy kontrol nad proizvodstvom: teoriya, istoriya, sovremennost'" [Worker Control Over Production: Theory, History, Present Day], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1983, 415 pages.

with great fullness all three aspects of the problem in question denoted in the book's title: theory, history and present day.

The monograph carefully traces the long and far from simple path of quests by West European communist parties and class trade unions for the creative application of a Marxist-Leninist approach to the problem of worker control with regard for national specifics and the changing historical conditions of the class struggle. The section devoted to the years of revolutionary upsurge in the European capitalist countries and the period 1924-1939, which is reflected very scantily in postwar Soviet literature, is of great interest in this respect.

The author recalls that the experience of the international workers movement of the 1920's and 1930's, which was critically examined and collated at the Seventh Comintern Congress, was not in vain: "it was used by the working class under the conditions of the new upsurge of the worker and democratic movement which began after the rout of fascism and the end of World War II" (p 215).

A synthesis of such experience was the demand for democratic control over production put forward in the postwar period by the revolutionary organizations of the working class as an integral part of their antimonopoly programs. The book comprehensively examines the objective factors which contributed to the stimulation of the movement for democratic control over production in the 1950's-1970's. The researcher notes that a demand for the working people's equal participation in the elaboration of economic and social policy and control of its implementation is a part of the program documents of practically all parties of the working class and all trade union centers, irrespective of their ideological-political orientation. At the same time there are profound differences between organizations of the working people's participation in the control of production and also in an evaluation of this specific form or the other of such participation. Together with the revolutionary platform of democratic control over production the reformist concepts of "economic democracy," "worker coparticipation in enterprise management," "socialization" of the means of production by means of converting part of the wage into company shares and so forth are widespread in the workers movement of the said countries.

Characterizing the consistently class-based interpretation of the "democratic control over production" formula, the author adduces the pronouncements of prominent figures of the communist movement in West Europe and quotes the decisions of congresses and program documents of the communist parties of France, the FRG, Portugal, Austria, Great Britain and other countries, which emphasize the important role of the movement for democratic control as an integral part of the struggle against the policy of state-monopoly capitalism. This slogan, the monograph observes, reflects "the endeavor to extend the influence of the working class to the spheres which hitherto have been within the competence only of the employers themselves and the endeavor via intervention in management and participation in decision-making and control over the implementation of these decisions at enterprises and in the economy as a whole to limit the power of the monopolies to dispose of the means of

production, capital investments, prices and profit" (p 407). In developing the struggle for democratic control the communist parties constantly recall that this task may be accomplished in full only on the basis of the transfer of all power to the working people and the liquidation of big capitalist ownership.

In bourgeois literature and also in reformist organizations of the working class the problem of democratization of the economy is frequently narrowed to a question of the working people's participation in a variety of representative bodies involved in production control. As a counterweight to this viewpoint, V. Vinogradov emphasizes that the movement for democratic control is also realized in means of influencing the policy of monopolies and governments which have been tested many times over (strikes and other mass actions of the working people themselves, collective bargaining systems, the parliamentary struggle of workers parties and so forth) and in forms which earlier were in an embryonic state or did not exist at all (institutions of worker representation at enterprises and the participation of trade unions in various regional and national bodies created by the state for the purpose of regulating the economy). The book analyzes in detail the practice of the use of both traditional and new methods of struggle.

The question of the working people's representation in bodies making decisions in economic and social spheres or involved in their preparation has assumed particular seriousness in the European capitalist countries. A continuous struggle around this issue is under way between labor and capital and between bourgeois and workers parties. The polemic within the workers movement is incessant also. The book reveals the causes of both. One is rooted in the persistent attempts of the ruling class to use the representative bodies to integrate the workers movement in the system of state-monopoly capitalism, a second is the limited nature of the functions and possibilities of these bodies and a third is the differing approach of the organizations of the working class to the tasks of these bodies and their activity in them. There is an undoubted danger of the representative bodies being turned into an instrument of "social partnership," nonetheless, it cannot serve as an argument against their use by the working people. Marxist-Leninist parties emphasize in this connection that the movement for democratic control over production should correspond to the fundamental goals and principles of the class struggle.

A big place is devoted in the book to an analysis of the positions of reformist organizations, primarily the trade union centers of West European countries. The author justifiably links the changes in their attitude toward the struggle for participation in production control with the general evolution of the trade union movement in West Europe, primarily with the trend toward the broadening of the tasks and the framework of the activity of the trade unions, which has exposed the groundlessness of the theory and practice of "professional trade unionism" and anarcho- or Christian syndicalism. Both the process of a turn to the left in the reformist trade unions and the sharply strengthened trend toward unity of action of the working people have operated in this same direction.

Under the influence of these general changes, the monograph emphasizes, there is a growing understanding in the reformist trade union movement of the inevitability of the transition from "struggle for distribution of the derived social product between labor and capital to the struggle to participate in economic decision-making and the elaboration of economic and social policy at all levels--from the enterprise through the national economy--in short, to the struggle for democratic control over production" (p 283). Of course, this has not removed profound differences between the consistently class-based and reformist understandings of the content and ultimate goals of the struggle for democratic control. However, there is a rapprochement of practical positions and also a number of program demands in this sphere, and this has created more favorable opportunities for the further development of the unity of action of the working class and its increased influence on the socioeconomic policy of the monopolies and the state.

As the author shows, the experience of the struggle for democratic control over production accumulated by the workers movement of the European capitalist countries in the past three decades is far from synonymous: it has, figuratively speaking, both light and shade. But as a whole, the work emphasizes, practice has answered in the affirmative the main question--concerning the need for the use of all forms of struggle both for the more effective defense of the working people's day-to-day interests and for preparation of the conditions for a fundamental transformation of social relations.

A few words about questions which have not been sufficiently illustrated. One of them concerns the interconnection of traditional forms of class struggle with the movement for democratic control. The sections devoted to individual countries adduce considerable factual material corroborating the justification of the author's proposition that the said interconnection is strengthening. Nonetheless, it would by no means have been superfluous for the book to have had, say, a section containing a summary description of the evolution of the strike movement and collective bargaining system, thanks to which these forms of class struggle have become organically interwoven with the struggle for the working people's participation in production control.

Another question which awaits additional research is non-Marxist theories of democratization of the economy. The author makes a fundamental class evaluation of some of them, mainly reformist concepts of social democracy and of the trade unions which follow it. However, a comprehensive critical analysis of such doctrines and, even more, of bourgeois scholars' views on the problem in question has remained outside of the framework of the study.

As a whole, however, V. Vinogradov's monograph is a thorough, interesting work which illustrates with great fullness the development of the revolutionary theory and practice of the struggle of the working class of the capitalist states for democratic control over production over a long historical period. It undoubtedly advances the study of problems of the international workers movement.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

ROLE OF PERSIAN GULF OIL IN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 143-145

[A. El'yanov review: "Oil--Economy--Policy"]

[Text] Dozens and hundreds of the most diverse publications are devoted to the role of oil in the economy and policy of the modern world. Particularly close attention is attracted by questions connected with Near East oil, which accounts for approximately two-thirds of assayed reserves of this most valuable raw material and fuel outside of the socialist world. Nonetheless, it is difficult to overlook A. Primakov's book,* which is very modest in size, but highly trenchant, which appeared recently. Leafing through this book, one feels particularly the loss sustained by our science in connection with the untimely departure from life of the author, who had not even reached the age of 28. And although the book in question is essentially the first test of his pen, it may serve as an example of a bold, creative approach to a study of the most burning problems of our time.

The author's attention is concentrated on a study of three key questions: the crisis of the imperialist system of exploitation of Near East oil; rent and price-forming in the Near East's oil industry; and relations among the oil-exporting countries, the oil monopolies and the imperialist states following nationalization. As you would imagine, the radical changes which have occurred in the past 10-15 years in the mechanism of exploitation of Near East oil and their influence on the socioeconomic evolution of the Persian Gulf countries and these countries' place in current international economic relations and also on the development of the oil market and the world capitalist economy as a whole are connected with these problems to a decisive extent.

Developing the first of the three subjects chosen for study, A. Primakov scrupulously traces on the basis of a vast amount of factual material the main stages and forms of the Persian Gulf countries' offensive against the positions of foreign capital in the oil industry and of the interconnection of this

* A.Ye. Primakov, "Persidskiy zaliv: neft' i monopolii" [The Persian Gulf: Oil and the Monopolies] (Exec. ed. I.D. Ivanov), Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Mysl'", 1983, 160 pages.

offensive with the development of the national liberation movement as a whole and the oil-exporting states' active use of interimperialist conflicts in the struggle to restore national sovereignty over their principal natural resource.

As the book convincingly shows, a considerable role in their liberation from the stifling embraces of the "oil octopus" was performed by strategy and tactics of the struggle for their legitimate interests whereby the success of this country or the other on the oil front in time inevitably became the property of all the other oil-exporting states, and not only in the Near East, furthermore (p 43-48). The chain was broken, as a rule, primarily by those which pursued "the most consistent anti-imperialist policy" (p 42). But the logic of the struggle and the pressure of public opinion prompted the following of the same course even by states whose ruling circles are supporters of a "moderate," even conservative policy in relations with imperialism.

I believe that largely thanks to this course of events, the neocolonial system of the exploitation of the Near East countries, which came to replace colonial-type concession relations, has not yet managed essentially to establish itself and has found itself in a state of profound crisis, whose main manifestation the author rightly discerns in the ending of the imperialist monopolies' control over the price-forming process on the world oil market (p 49). As a result there has been a profound transformation of the entire system of the cost relations which take shape in connection with the exploitation of the Near East countries' oil resources, the formation of world prices for oil and the distribution of the revenues which it provides.

Taking the Marxist theory of rent as a basis, A. Primakov has boldly undertaken a study of an extraordinarily complex and multifaceted problem and has, in general, handled it highly successfully. While paying tribute to the author's numerous successes--of both an individual and general nature--that is, we believe, undoubtedly among the most significant; he has demonstrated a profound content analysis not only of economic and political economy questions proper but also of "purely" political questions.

The analysis is conducted in accordance with three main directions. First, the specifics of price-forming for limited resources are examined at the theoretical level, then there is a study of the current oil price and rent and in conclusion the new situation in the oil market which had taken shape at the start of the 1980's is described. While enlisting a wealth of factual material, the author has, however, refrained from the temptation to attempt to determine the quantitative parameters of the material basis of rent and its components in the price of Near East oil. And correctly so. Considering the multilevel nature and varying scale of the huge number of factors of a general economic, situational and political nature under whose influence the general level of world oil prices and rent itself is formed, such an attempt could hardly have been successful. Nonetheless, he has managed to provide the entire necessary source material for inferences on this question.

In particular, it is clear from the research that has been done that absolute rent in the Near East's oil-producing industry has grown into monopoly rent, the limit of which is conditioned, in K. Marx's words, merely by "demand and the solvency of the purchasers" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 25, Part II, p 324.). And grown, furthermore, not only and, rather, not so much even as a result of the increase in the organic composition of capital in the said sector but as a consequence of the repeated increases in world oil prices. The latter, having changed the general price proportions in the world capitalist economy, have led to a tangible redistribution in favor of the oil-producing countries of the product being created there.

The forecast of the general conditions of the market and the probable dynamics of oil prices in the 1980's made in the work in connection with the analysis of the changes in the system of price-forming is also of independent significance. The author has actually had to make a multifactor analysis here, whose main results have essentially already been corroborated by the actual course of events, although the period embraced by the forecast is far from over.

The analysis of the relations which took shape following nationalization in the oil-exporting countries--oil monopolies--imperialist states triangle with which the monograph closes is also of considerable interest. And it is not even a question only of a highly fruitful attempt to provide a forecast of these relations for the foreseeable future or of a portrayal of a certain nonconcurrence of the private interests and goals of the oil concerns and the imperialist states reflecting the interests of the entire state-monopoly complex. Although, we would note, both undoubtedly merit the closest attention. In our view, the main attraction of this section, as, incidentally, surely of the entire book also, is that it excites thought, forcing contemplation once again of the questions broached here. Among them is primarily the problem of the socioeconomic essence of the new forms of the Near East countries' ties to and relations with the oil concerns and the state-monopoly structures of the developed capitalist countries as a whole.

The author rightly notes that owing to the oil-producing countries' lack of experience and technical and sometimes financial opportunities for the independent development and realization of the oil resources following nationalization, they could hardly have been expected to renounce all relations with the oil monopolies. Business contacts with the latter, as the book emphasizes entirely justifiably, "could in principle be used to accelerate economic development and ultimately to strengthen economic independence" (p 103). Such, essentially, is the dialectic of life, which, probably, is taken into consideration not only by progressive but also conservative regimes of the oil-exporting countries if they have joined in the active struggle for a "place in the sun". A failure to understand it is fraught with the danger of serious errors in an evaluation of current, as, equally, possible future, trends in the social life of both groups of these states.

There is a slight hitch merely in the fact that this exceptionally important proposition, like a number of other of the author's propositions also (concerning the profound crisis of the entire neocolonial system of the

exploitation of Near East oil, the conversion of the countries which possess it from voiceless objects into equal subjects of world "oil" policy and the growth of absolute rent into monopoly rent) does not entirely agree with the assertion that the above-mentioned countries are viewed, as before, merely as an object of neocolonialist exploitation on the part of imperialism.

In speaking of this, we do not in the least intend to dispute the very existence of a system of neocolonialism and, even less, its disastrous influence on the fate of the former colonies and semicolonies. But we believe, nonetheless, that now this system no longer encompasses and cannot encompass the entire sum of relations between the developing and developed capitalist states and in the economic plane by no means amounts merely to the latter's exploitation of the former. Moreover, in a number of cases, like, for example, in the relations of the same oil-exporting Near East states with imperialism, such exploitation is hardly the main and, even less, all-encompassing sign of the neocolonialist system which has arisen on the debris of the former colonial-type concessions. Deprived of the opportunity of controlling all phases of price-forming in the oil business, the dominant monopolies in this sphere and the imperialist states importing liquid fuel, as the author observes perfectly correctly, "have been able to pass the increase in the purchase price of oil onto the consumers and not only have not incurred financial losses here but have increased their revenues" (p 121).

This does not mean, of course, that the OPEC countries are now quite unsubjected to exploitation. They undoubtedly are subjected, and, what is more, possibly on an immeasurably greater scale than before. But, possibly, primarily in other, nonoil spheres of the economic life and in other areas of economic relations with imperialism. Together with the main economic results of the struggle of the oil-producing states for the restoration of national sovereignty over the leading sector of their economy, this also reflects the tremendous difficulties which all the developing countries are encountering in the struggle for complete economic decolonization. Such broad generalizations suggest themselves upon contemplation of the undoubtedly very interesting and useful book of A. Primakov, who, unfortunately, will himself not continue the successful research which he has begun.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

LUKIN BOOK ON U.S., EUROPEAN, JAPANESE CHANGES IN INFLUENCE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 147-150

[V. Baranovskiy review: "Important Facet of International Relations"]

[Text] The book in question* would be of undoubted interest even if its content had amounted to a comparative international-political description or summary survey of the foreign policy of global and regional power centers (in the first case it is a question of the United States, the West European countries and Japan, in the second of India, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Israel, Nigeria, South Africa, Brazil and Mexico). However, it sets a broader (and, we would add, more complex) task. It is a question of an attempt to examine the actual and latent potential at the disposal of each of the enumerated states, primarily from the viewpoint of the extent to which it enables them to play the part of active "character" in the world arena. What determines the nature of this part, what are the objectively conditioned limits of the international-political influence of the corresponding states and how are the power-center status or claims thereto reflected in foreign policy behavior--such is the specific, particular angle from which the problems raised in the work are analyzed.

The author ascertains certain important trends of current international-political development outside of the socialist world. It is a question, first, of an objective diminution in the foreign policy potential of the United States; second, of the consolidation of the West European power center and its enhanced role in international relations; and third, of the pronounced foreign policy activation of Japan which has been observed most recently. As far as many regional power centers are concerned, their role in international-political development, V. Lukin believes, as, equally, the scale of actual influence, is often simply impossible to consider conclusively established--the impact of internal political factors and specific circumstances taking shape in the corresponding parts of the world is so palpable here. For example, the general recession in the world capitalist cycle of the start of the 1980's in combination with the change in the oil

* V.P. Lukin, "'Tsentry sily': kontseptsii i real'nost'" ['Power Centers': Conceptions and Reality], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1983, 256 pages.

situation has brought about crisis phenomena in the economy and a general decline in the power-center potential in such highly diverse and far-removed countries as Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Nigeria and Brazil.

Thus the process of activation of this big state or the other in the world arena or within the framework of a regional subsystem of international relations frequently proves uneven and subject to temporary "spurts" and "slumps". Attempting to analyze such changes, Western political scientists frequently switch from one extreme to another. What yesterday even they were prepared to declare the Iraqi, Brazilian, Arab or some other "miracle" (economic, oil, military and so forth) they are today beginning to manifestly underestimate or disregard altogether. "Yet," V. Lukin rightly observes in this connection, "miracles appear where the real patterns of the historical process have not been revealed or understood. A close look at the evolution of any claimant to the role of 'power center' shows that it is subordinate to the basic regularities of the development of the current international-political situation" (pp 237-238).

The foreign policy independence of the claimants to the role of power centers, the book observes, is in a whole number of respects of a limited nature. In order to perform a dynamic, aggressive foreign policy role countries which are or wish to be power centers often have to exert the maximum effort, which is at times beyond their potential. In this soil "even such specific regional gendarmes artificially cultivated by imperialism as South Africa and Israel at times display their own pretensions and ambitions and create certain difficulties and inconveniences for those who with complete justification regard themselves as their guardians and suzerains" (p 237).

But in many instances this is merely an apparent autonomy and an illusory breadth of possibilities of individual-country self-assertion. While the ambitions of aspiring politicians and even whole groups of the ruling class possessing higher-than-usual dynamism or adhering to an expansionist orientation may perform merely a kind of formative function for such foreign policy activism. At deeper and more significant levels powerful inhibitors are revealed restraining a surplus thereof either through the creation of effective incentives for group discipline or through a tangible increase in the price of the sanctions which inevitably follow manifest violations of the "rules of the game" dictated by the evolved objective conditions of international-political development.

This conclusion essentially applies not only to the activity of states which manifest greater-than-usual assertiveness at the regional level but also to the foreign policy of the biggest imperialist power center with indisputable global potential--the United States. As the book in question rightly observes, the American ruling elite is only belatedly recognizing the objective processes which have been occurring in the world since World War II, and for this reason "attempts to adapt to the new reality in a pragmatic spirit are combined with quite lengthy periods of nostalgia for the disappearing past" (p 60). The foreign policy course of the present administration has been developed on the basis of distorted ideas about the surrounding world. The attempts, on the other hand, of people from the White House to "adapt" reality to their ideas of

the world can bring the United States only fruit of dubious quality like the "major military victory over world communism"--the invasion of Grenada. It appears that in the course of the struggle for reelection President R. Reagan will have to present this shameful action as a major U.S. foreign policy "achievement". Any other more significant results of the activity of the administration, which aspires to the restoration of an undoubtedly privileged position of the American power center, with no consideration for anyone or anything, simply do not exist.

Numerous difficulties are also arising in the way of the establishment of the West European power center. The economic integration of a number of states of the region within the EEC framework is not the equivalent of the creation of such a center (p 71), while the acute conflicts between Common Market participants on a broad range of questions--from the budget through agricultural policy--entail serious problems not only in the plane of the internal evolution of the integration association but also from the viewpoint of its international-political influence. However, "if this question is approached from the standpoints of a longer perspective," the book observes, "...the preservation and multiplication of objective trends and subjective motivations operating in a direction leading to the consolidation of the West European 'power center' become obvious (p 98). Less pronounced as yet is the global political role of the third imperialist center--Japan--although the West European, Latin American and Near East directions in its activity are gradually being galvanized; thereby, the author believes, certain elements are beginning to take shape "from which Japan's strategy in future decades may be formed" (p 129).

In a study sustained on the basis of such extensive material not all propositions and arguments are necessarily equally indisputable. And there is no contradiction in the fact that it is this fact which makes the work even more attractive for the specialist and for any thoughtful reader, inviting him to differ, argue and put forward his own explanation of this aspect of the problem or the other.

Thus, for example, the author rightly points to the fact that a struggle of two opposite groupings is usually under way in this form or the other on the question of the general directions of foreign policy orientation in the ruling class of the imperialist powers. If the distinction between them is made in the most general plane, in one case pride of place is given the task of close coordination of the actions of the leading capitalist powers and a certain subordination of single-country ambitions and pretensions to these more general tasks; in the other the emphasis is put on actions which are more unilateral, nationalist and "egotistical" in respect of one's capitalist partners. Such a provisional division appears legitimate, as does, equally, the thought that in the second case, appealing to "traditions of national greatness," the intra-country power potential is usually interpreted more or less arbitrarily. But to consider only a second grouping the "vector of power-center ambitions" (p 16) is, we believe, somewhat one-sided. It may pursue more adventurist goals and its great-power ambitions may be expressed more precisely and candidly, but this does not mean that the other grouping, which is more "concerned" for the defense of the common interests of the imperialist camp,

necessarily ignores the actual existence of different power centers within this camp or necessarily sacrifices the interests of its own country for this purpose.

With reference to the activity of the United States this means that a power-center policy and the doctrine of "interdependence" cannot be counterposed, as the book in question does. After all, in the latter case the reference was primarily to the consolidation of relations between three imperialist centers (and, it must be thought, not in order to weaken them). It is not fortuitous that opponents saw the "interdependence policy" of Carter and Brzezinski merely as an attempt by the American leadership "to restore to itself undisputed leadership in the world both at the expense of its main allies" (p 53). And it is this which is a typical power-center approach.

The monograph has made an interesting attempt to interpret the material that has been studied in the summary, conceptual plane. Having critically analyzed the "bipolar" and "multipolar" world concepts which are widespread in Western literature and the theoretical views of "political realists" and disciples of the "interdependence" doctrine, the authors show their one-sided and at the same time intrinsically contradictory nature, which leads to a distortion of the actual picture of international relations. Power center in contemporary world politics are a complex and contradictory phenomenon representing an essential international-political reality. "Ignoring this reality is just as unwarranted as its absolutization and an endeavor to construct thereon, and only thereon, the entire modern international-political structure" (p 240). The complex dynamics of the mutual relations of the two opposite social systems, the growing anti-imperialist potential of the nonaligned movement, the active role of many medium and small states in world politics, the activity of a variety of global (the United Nations) and regional international organizations--such are the most important factors which have to be taken into consideration first of all upon an analysis of the multifaceted world of present-day international relations. "And the so-called 'power centers' are only one and by no means its sharpest facet. At the same time there is no doubt that without this facet, without this reality the general picture of contemporary world politics would be incomplete and deprived of certain essential nuances" (pp 240-241). It is for this reason that V. Lukin's work, in which the said facet is studied from the viewpoint of Marxist-Leninist methodology, appears topical and significant.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

BOOKS DETAILING PROBLEMS OF ASEAN REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 84 (signed to press 16 Mar 84) pp 150-152

[E. Grebenshchikov review: "Behind the Facade of Official Declarations"]

[Text] Since the time of its formation in August 1967 ASEAN has trodden a considerable path of development. An analysis of the trends and results of this evolution in a period which has been filled with events of exceptional importance for Southeast Asia is particularly topical in the light of the present situation in the region, which could in no way be called happy.

The authors of the works in question* study ASEAN's problems and achievements and the level of prospects of the cooperation of the states which are a part thereof. They give much attention to the members' measures in the commercial-economic sphere, which, in accordance with the organization's charter, are to constitute the leading sphere of its activity.

Investigating the efforts made in this sphere, V. Samoylenko concludes that "these tasks of the rapprochement of the five countries in the commercial-economic sphere... are as yet being tackled slowly, with great difficulties" (I, p 89). M. Khaldin is more categorical in his opinions: ASEAN, he believes, "is merely at the distant approach to the creation of a free-trade zone--the first stage of capitalist economic integration" (II, pp 116-117). The inordinate orientation of ASEAN's foreign trade toward the industrial capitalist states (II, p 95) and the subordinate position of the state and mixed sectors (I, p 65) are highlighted as being among the most important reasons for this situation.

A dark shadow on the prospects of the integration process on a subregional basis, which has not yet gathered pace and is essentially at the starting point, is being cast by the activity of the transnational corporations, which are "disintegrating the economy" and championing and in fact purposefully implementing "their version of economic integration in Southeast Asia" (II, pp 150, 152).

* I. V. V. Samoylenko, "ASEAN. Politika i ekonomika" [ASEAN. Policy and Economy], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1982, 191 pages. II. M. A. Khaldin, "ASEAN bez illyuziy" [ASEAN Without Illusions], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1983, 174 pages.

The numerous malfunctions, if not to say failures in the establishment of commercial-economic cooperation under the aegis of ASEAN are seriously damaging its prestige. The ruling circles of the members are undoubtedly aware in view of this of the "acute political need" for some fruitful measures in the said sphere (II, p 123). But for a whole number of objective and subjective reasons they are displaying as a whole an incapacity for securing a decisive change in the necessary direction. In our view, it is only possible with great reservations to agree with V. Samoylenko, who believes that "political interest" and "political will" are making it possible to find "compromise solutions of the problems which arise" and achieve "the gradual development of subregional economic interrelations" (I, p 89). It is precisely the lack of coordination of the members' actions, the extreme inefficiency of the work of the association's bureaucratic machinery and its lack of training for the accomplishment of urgent tasks in the economic sphere which are more characteristic of ASEAN. For this reason M. Khaldin is right when he stresses the seriousness of the problems and contradictions, and not only economic but also political, furthermore, within ASEAN and the incessant clashes between the partners, which testify to the limited nature or transparency even of so-called "ASEAN solidarity" (II, p 139). At the same time attention needs to be drawn to something else also: that which is uncoupling the ASEAN countries is closely interwoven or proceeding in parallel with a unifying trend; sometimes one, sometimes the other line has prevailed at different stages and in different instances in the activity of the grouping.

The ruling regimes of the partner countries, which stand on the class and ideological platform of anticommunism, are demonstrating considerably greater coordination of action than in the economic sphere in the foreign policy field. This applies particularly to the counteraction of the strengthening of the positions of socialism in Southeast Asia, the attempts to restore the situation which existed in Indochina prior to 1979 and hankerings frequently going far beyond the framework of diplomacy. The coordination of foreign policy activity has been expressed primarily in the advancement of joint political doctrines (the idea of the "neutralization" of Southeast Asia and the 'regional resistance' concept, a detailed analysis of which is contained in both books). Here the association is demonstrating incomparably greater assertiveness than in other spheres, which permits the authors to consider its political function the leading and determining function.

What is the international role of ASEAN, in which pan of the scales has the grouping's political weight been placed?

"ASEAN has not succeeded in finding the right tone in the approach to a solution of political regional matters in conjunction with the neighboring states" (II, p 131). This is M. Khaldin's conclusion, and it undoubtedly applies primarily to the problem of relations between the two groups of states of Southeast Asia--the members of the association and the socialist countries of Indochina. As V. Samoylenko observes, "the slogan of ASEAN unity was employed to impose on the whole association an unrealistic position" with respect to the so-called "Kampuchea question" (I, p 105). As is known, many authoritative political and public figures in the member states categorize as mistaken and disastrous the line which ASEAN is following on this "question".

This fact shows once again that ASEAN is a far from monolithic bloc; there are different currents, including supporters and opponents of alignment with the West, within the grouping and in each of its component countries also. The correlation of forces here between different factions in the ruling circles is not rigidly prescribed but is subject to constant change, which, we would note, could have been more adequately reflected in the books in question.

Different forms and areas of cooperation, which, as is known, extends to military problems also, have become prevalent within the ASEAN framework. "While developing very active bilateral cooperation... and maintaining multilateral contacts in the security sphere, the leaders of the ASEAN countries are carefully avoiding imparting to the association the nature of an unconcealed "military alliance" or "defense pact" (I, pp 56-57). The author of the other book agrees that the grouping "has moved away from the historically compromised pro-imperialist military-political blocs of the time of the cold war" (II, p 170), but he justifiably adds that "a program of multilateral military-political cooperation within the ASEAN framework is being realized" (II, p 74) in the form of formally bilateral measures.

The growing level of military cooperation and the extension of the reciprocal military commitments of the partners in the grouping serve as evidence that "in fact, if not formally allied relations are already taking shape" between them (II, p 80). M. Khaldin supports his proposition with a wealth of material. Interaction in the military sphere is formally being effected not under the aegis of ASEAN and is not within the jurisdiction of the grouping but it cannot be ignored when determining the profile of this organization, whose founders repeatedly proclaimed its "nonmilitary" nature.

The sharply critical view of the Soviet authors, who chose as their method a comparison of the promises and declarations of the leaders of the ASEAN countries with the steps they are taking in practice and the actual results that have been obtained in the sphere of regional cooperation, by no means signifies any negative attitude toward an evaluation of ASEAN. Thus V. Samoylenko notes the attempts of the members "to achieve greater mutual understanding and overcome the alienation and mutual mistrust and suspicion which had evolved over decades" (I, p 143). Such efforts can only be welcomed. "The members of the organization are, of course, adopting certain measures to ease... neocolonialist-type dependence" in the course of trade and political negotiations with the leading capitalist powers of the Pacific and also the EEC. "Taking advantage of the collective negotiating power of the five, the association has succeeded in establishing an organizational mechanism of these 'dialogues'," M. Khaldin emphasizes (II, pp 146, 147).

Difficult tests await ASEAN. Imperialist pressure and the intrigues of internal reaction represent a serious obstacle in the way of the achievement of the goals officially proclaimed by the association. Only the abandonment of confrontation with and the hostile policy in respect of the socialist countries of Indochina is capable of ensuring a normalization of the situation, lasting peace and a better future for the much-suffering peoples of Southeast Asia.

Despite all their merits, the books in question are not free, in our view, of certain individual shortcomings and oversights. Thus they lack sections devoted to the USSR's relations with the ASEAN countries. The subject of interimperialist contradictions in the zone of the association, which are making themselves felt constantly, is virtually unbroached. Despite their limited size, both books could have found space for these questions, thanks, for example, to a certain tightening of the text and the removal of repetitions.

These observations in no way detract from the general impression of monographs written on a high scientific level. They will both be of undoubted interest not only to specialists but also a broad readership.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/8

- END -

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

17 July 1984